

Employers Holdings, Inc.
Form 10-K
February 19, 2015

UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20549

FORM 10-K

R ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF
1934

For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2014

OR

o TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF
1934

For the transition period from ____ to ____

Commission file number: 001-33245

EMPLOYERS HOLDINGS, INC.

(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

Nevada

(State or other jurisdiction

of incorporation or organization)

10375 Professional Circle, Reno, Nevada 89521

(Address of principal executive offices and zip code)

(888) 682-6671

(Registrant's telephone number, including area code)

04-3850065

(I.R.S. Employer

Identification Number)

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Act:

Title of each class

Common Stock, \$0.01 par value per share

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Act: None

Name of each exchange on which registered

New York Stock Exchange

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is a well-known seasoned issuer, as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act.

Yes R No o

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is not required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or Section 15(d) of the Exchange Act.

Yes o No R

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant: (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days. Yes R No o

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant has submitted electronically and posted on its corporate Web site, if any, every Interactive Data File required to be submitted and posted pursuant to Rule 405 of Regulation S-T (§232.405 of this chapter) during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required

Edgar Filing: Employers Holdings, Inc. - Form 10-K

to submit and post such files). Yes R No o

Indicate by check mark if disclosure of delinquent filers pursuant to Item 405 of Regulation S-K is not contained herein, and will not be contained, to the best of registrant's knowledge, in definitive proxy or information statements incorporated by reference in Part III of this Form 10-K or any amendment to this Form 10-K. R

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, a non-accelerated filer, or a smaller reporting company. See definitions of "large accelerated filer," "accelerated filer," "non-accelerated filer," and "smaller reporting company" in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act. (Check one):

Large accelerated filer R Accelerated filer o Non-accelerated filer o Smaller reporting company o

The aggregate market value of the voting and non-voting common equity held by non-affiliates of the registrant as of June 30, 2014 was \$662,932,517.

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act). Yes o No R

Class	February 12, 2015
Common Stock, \$0.01 par value per share	31,493,828 shares outstanding

DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

Portions of the registrant's Definitive Proxy Statement relating to the 2015 Annual Meeting of Stockholders are incorporated by reference in Items 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 of Part III of this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
Forward-Looking Statements	<u>3</u>
 <u>PART I</u>	
Item 1 Business	<u>4</u>
Item 1A Risk Factors	<u>15</u>
Item 1B Unresolved Staff Comments	<u>22</u>
Item 2 Properties	<u>22</u>
Item 3 Legal Proceedings	<u>22</u>
Item 4 Mine Safety Disclosures	<u>22</u>
 <u>PART II</u>	
Item 5 Market for Registrant's Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities	<u>23</u>
Item 6 Selected Financial Data	<u>25</u>
Item 7 Management's Discussion and Analysis of Consolidated Financial Condition and Results of Operations	<u>27</u>
Item 7A Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk	<u>42</u>
Item 8 Financial Statements and Supplementary Data	<u>44</u>
Item 9 Changes in and Disagreements with Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosure	<u>73</u>
Item 9A Controls and Procedures	<u>73</u>
Item 9B Other Information	<u>74</u>
 <u>PART III</u>	
Item 10 Directors, Executive Officers and Corporate Governance	<u>75</u>
Item 11 Executive Compensation	<u>75</u>
Item 12 Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters	<u>75</u>
Item 13 Certain Relationships and Related Transactions and Director Independence	<u>75</u>
Item 14 Principal Accountant Fees and Services	<u>75</u>
 <u>PART IV</u>	
Item 15 Exhibits and Financial Statement Schedules	<u>76</u>

FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS

The Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 provides a safe harbor for forward-looking statements if accompanied by meaningful cautionary statements identifying important factors that could cause actual results to differ materially from those discussed. Undue reliance should not be placed on these statements, which speak only as of the date of this report. Forward-looking statements include those related to our expected financial position, business, financing plans, litigation, future premiums, revenues, earnings, pricing, investments, business relationships, expected losses, loss experience, loss reserves, acquisitions, competition, the impact of changes in interest rates, rate increases with respect to our business, and the insurance industry in general. Statements including words such as “expect,” “intend,” “plan,” “believe,” “estimate,” “may,” “anticipate,” “will” or similar statements of a future or forward-looking nature identify forward-looking statements.

We undertake no obligation to publicly update or revise any forward-looking statements, whether as a result of new information, future events or otherwise, except as required by law. All forward-looking statements address matters that involve risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results to differ materially from historical or anticipated results, depending on a number of factors. These risks and uncertainties include, but are not limited to, those set forth in Item 1A, “Risk Factors” and the other documents that we have filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

NOTE REGARDING RELIANCE ON STATEMENTS IN OUR CONTRACTS

The agreements included or incorporated by reference as exhibits to this Annual Report on Form 10-K may contain representations and warranties by each of the parties to the applicable agreement. These representations and warranties were made solely for the benefit of the other parties to the applicable agreement and:

- were not intended to be treated as categorical statements of fact, but rather as a way of allocating the risk to one of the parties if those statements prove to be inaccurate;
- may have been qualified in such agreement by disclosures that were made to the other party in connection with the negotiation of the applicable agreement;
- may apply contract standards of “materiality” that are different from “materiality” under the applicable securities laws; and
- were made only as of the date of the applicable agreement or such other date or dates as may be specified in the agreement.

Notwithstanding the inclusion of the foregoing cautionary statements, we acknowledge that we are responsible for considering whether additional specific disclosures of material information regarding material contractual provisions are required to make the statements in this report not misleading.

PART I

Item 1. Business

General

Employers Holdings, Inc. (EHI) is a holding company incorporated in Nevada in 2005. Unless otherwise indicated, all references to “we,” “us,” “our,” the “Company” or similar terms refer to EHI together with its subsidiaries. We had 709 full-time employees at December 31, 2014 and our principal executive offices are located at 10375 Professional Circle in Reno, Nevada.

Our insurance subsidiaries have each been assigned an A.M. Best Company (A.M. Best) rating of “A-” (Excellent), with a “negative” financial outlook.

Our Annual Reports on Form 10-K, Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q, Current Reports on Form 8-K, amendments to those reports, and Proxy Statements for our Annual Meetings of Stockholders are available free of charge on our website at www.employers.com as soon as reasonably practicable after they are electronically filed with or furnished to the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). Our website also provides access to reports filed by our Directors, executive officers and certain significant stockholders pursuant to Section 16 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. In addition, our Corporate Governance Guidelines, Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, Code of Ethics for Senior Financial Officers, and charters for the Audit, Board Governance and Nominating, and Compensation committees of our Board of Directors are available on our website. Copies of these documents may also be obtained free of charge by written request to Investor Relations, 10375 Professional Circle, Reno, Nevada 89521-4802. The SEC also maintains a website at www.sec.gov that contains the information that we file electronically with the SEC.

Strategy

Our strategy is to pursue profitable growth opportunities across market cycles and maximize total investment returns within the constraints of prudent portfolio management. We execute this strategy by focusing on disciplined underwriting and claims management, utilizing medical provider networks designed to produce superior medical and indemnity outcomes, establishing and maintaining strong, long-term relationships with independent insurance agencies, and developing important alternative distribution channels. In 2014, we began execution of a number of strategic initiatives, including: centralizing management of sales and underwriting operations; creating a new department focused on internal and customer facing business process excellence; slowing policy count growth in California as we diversify our risk exposure across our markets; establishing a three-company pricing platform in California with newly approved rates and territorial multipliers; strengthening the linkage between pricing and class code performance; and targeting attractive classes of business across all of our markets.

Description of Business

We are a specialty provider of workers' compensation insurance focused on select small businesses in low to medium hazard industries. We employ a disciplined, conservative underwriting approach designed to individually select specific types of businesses, predominantly those in the lowest four of the seven workers' compensation insurance industry defined hazard groups, that we believe will have fewer and less costly claims relative to other businesses in the same hazard groups. Workers' compensation is provided for under a statutory system wherein most employers are required to provide coverage for their employees' medical, disability, vocational rehabilitation, and/or death benefit costs for work-related injuries or illnesses. We operate as a single reportable segment and conduct operations in 31 states and the District of Columbia, with a concentration in California, where over one-half of our business is generated. We had total assets of \$3.8 billion and \$3.6 billion at December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively. The following table highlights key results of our operations for the last three years.

	Years Ended December 31,			
	2014	2013	2012	
	(in thousands, except ratios)			
Net premiums written	\$687,624	\$678,466	\$569,676	
Total revenue	773,467	723,581	579,182	
Net income	100,684	63,824	106,891	
Combined ratio ⁽¹⁾	97.0	% 103.9	% 95.3	%

Edgar Filing: Employers Holdings, Inc. - Form 10-K

Impact of the Loss Portfolio Transfer Agreement (LPT Agreement) ⁽²⁾	8.0	5.9	20.0	
Combined ratio before the impact of the LPT Agreement ⁽²⁾	105.0	% 109.8	% 115.3	%

The combined ratio, a key measurement of underwriting profitability, is the sum of the loss and loss adjustment (1) expenses (LAE), commission expenses, and underwriting and other operating expenses, measured as a percentage of earned premium.

The impact of the LPT Agreement includes: (a) amortization of Deferred reinsurance gain–LPT Agreement (Deferred Gain); (b) adjustments to LPT Agreement ceded reserves; and (c) adjustments to contingent commission receivable–LPT Agreement. Deferred Gain reflects the unamortized gain from our LPT Agreement. Under GAAP, this gain is deferred and is being amortized using the recovery method. Amortization is determined by the proportion of actual reinsurance recoveries to total estimated recoveries over the life of the LPT Agreement, except for the contingent profit commission, which is amortized through June 30, 2024. The amortization is reflected in losses and LAE. We periodically reevaluate the remaining direct reserves subject to the LPT Agreement and the expected losses and LAE subject to the contingent profit commission under the LPT Agreement. Our reevaluation results in corresponding adjustments, if needed, to reserves, ceded reserves, contingent commission receivable, and the Deferred Gain, with the net effect being an increase or decrease, as the case may be, to net income. Combined ratio before impact of the LPT Agreement is not a measurement of financial performance under GAAP, but rather reflects the difference in accounting treatment between statutory accounting principles and GAAP, and should not be considered in isolation or as an alternative to the combined ratio or any other measure of performance derived in accordance with GAAP.

Our insurance subsidiaries are domiciled in the following states:

	State of Domicile
Employers Insurance Company of Nevada (EICN)	Nevada
Employers Compensation Insurance Company (ECIC)	California
Employers Preferred Insurance Company (EPIC)	Florida
Employers Assurance Company (EAC)	Florida

Products and Services

Workers' compensation provides insurance coverage for the statutorily prescribed benefits that employers are required to provide to their employees who may be injured or suffer illness in the course of employment. The level of benefits varies by state, the nature and severity of the injury or disease, and the wages of the injured worker. Each state has a statutory, regulatory, and adjudicatory system that sets the amount of wage replacement to be paid, determines the level of medical care required to be provided, establishes the degree of permanent impairment, and specifies the options in selecting healthcare providers. These state laws generally require two types of benefits for injured employees: (a) medical benefits, including expenses related to the diagnosis and treatment of an injury, disease, or both, as well as any required rehabilitation, and (b) indemnity payments, which consist of temporary wage replacement, permanent disability payments, and death benefits to surviving family members.

Disciplined Underwriting

Our strategy is to focus on disciplined underwriting and continue to pursue profitable growth opportunities across market cycles. We carefully monitor market trends to assess new business opportunities that we expect will meet our pricing and risk standards. We price our policies based on the specific risks associated with each potential insured rather than solely on the industry class in which a potential insured is classified. Our disciplined underwriting approach is a critical element of our culture and we believe that it has allowed us to offer competitive prices, diversify our risks, and out-perform the industry.

We execute our underwriting processes through automated systems and experienced underwriters with specific knowledge of local markets. We have developed automated underwriting templates for specific classes of business that produce faster quotes when certain underwriting criteria are met. Our underwriting guidelines consider many factors, such as type of business, nature of operations, and risk exposures, and are designed to minimize or prevent underwriting of certain classes of business.

Loss Control

Our loss control professionals provide consultation to policyholders to assist them in preventing losses and containing costs once claims occur. They also assist our underwriting personnel in evaluating potential and current policyholders and are an important part of our underwriting discipline.

Premium Audit

We conduct premium audits on substantially all of our policyholders annually upon the policy expiration. Premium audits allow us to comply with applicable state and reporting bureau requirements and to verify that policyholders

have accurately reported their payroll and employee job classifications. We also selectively perform interim audits on certain classes of business or if unusual claims are filed or concerns are raised regarding projected annual payrolls, which could result in substantial variances at final audit.

Claims and Medical Case Management

The role of our claims department is to actively and efficiently investigate, evaluate, and pay claims, and to aid injured workers in returning to work in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. We have implemented rigorous claims guidelines and control procedures in our claims units and have claims operations throughout the markets we serve. We also provide medical case management services for those claims that we determine will benefit from such involvement.

Our claims department also provides claims management services for those claims incurred by the Nevada State Industrial Insurance System (the Fund) and assumed by EICN and subject to a 100% retroactive reinsurance agreement (the LPT Agreement) with dates of injury prior to July 1, 1995. Additional information regarding the LPT Agreement is set forth under “–Reinsurance–LPT Agreement.” We receive a management fee from the third party reinsurers equal to 7% of the loss payments on these claims.

We utilize medical provider networks designed to produce superior medical and indemnity outcomes and make every appropriate effort to direct injured workers into these networks for medical treatments. In addition to our medical networks, we work closely with local vendors, including attorneys, medical professionals, pharmacy benefits managers, and investigators, to bring local expertise to our reported claims. We pay special attention to reducing costs and have established discounting arrangements with the aforementioned service providers. We use preferred provider organizations, bill review services, and utilization management to closely monitor medical costs.

We actively pursue fraud and subrogation recoveries to mitigate claims costs. Subrogation rights are based upon state and federal laws, as well as the insurance policies we issue. Our fraud and subrogation efforts are handled through dedicated units.

Information Technology

Core Operating Systems

We have an efficient, cost-effective and scalable infrastructure that complements our geographic reach and business model and have developed a highly automated underwriting system. This technology applies our underwriting standards and guidelines and allows for the electronic submission, review, and quoting of insurance applications. This policy administration system reduces transaction costs and provides for more efficient and timely processing of applications for small policies that meet our underwriting standards. We believe this approach saves our independent agents and brokers considerable time in processing customer applications and maintains our competitiveness in our target markets. We will continue to invest in technology and systems across our business to maximize efficiency, facilitate customer self-service, and create increased capacity that will allow us to lower our expense ratios while growing premiums.

Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery

We maintain business continuity and disaster recovery plans for our critical business functions, including the restoration of information technology infrastructure and applications. We have two data centers that act as production facilities and as disaster recovery sites for each other. In addition, we utilize an off-site data storage facility for critical customer and systems data.

Customers and Workers' Compensation Premiums

The workers' compensation insurance industry classifies risks into seven hazard groups, as defined by the National Council on Compensation Insurance (NCCI), based on severity of claims, with businesses in the first or lowest group having the lowest claims costs.

We target select small businesses engaged in low to medium hazard industries. Our historical loss experience has been more favorable for lower industry defined hazard groups than for higher hazard groups. Further, we believe it is generally less costly to service and manage the risks associated with these lower hazard groups. Our underwriters use their local market expertise and disciplined underwriting to select specific types of businesses and risks within the classes of business we underwrite that allow us to generate loss ratios that are better than the industry average.

The following table sets forth our in-force premiums by hazard group and as a percentage of our total in-force premiums as of December 31:

Hazard Group	2014	Percentage of 2014 Total	2013	Percentage of 2013 Total	2012	Percentage of 2012 Total
	(in thousands, except percentages)					
A	\$165,655	26.4	% \$146,263	23.7	% \$120,863	22.5
B	159,291	25.4	130,009	21.1	136,849	25.5
C	207,458	33.0	239,497	38.8	182,416	33.9
D	82,641	13.2	80,910	13.1	77,148	14.4
E	11,024	1.7	18,557	3.0	15,850	2.9

Edgar Filing: Employers Holdings, Inc. - Form 10-K

F	1,760	0.3	2,122	0.3	4,128	0.8	
G	72	<0.1	66	<0.1	88	<0.1	
Total	\$627,901	100.0	% \$617,424	100.0	% \$537,342	100.0	%

6

In-force premiums for our top ten types of insureds and as a percentage of our total in-force premiums as of December 31, 2014 were as follows:

Employer Classifications	In-force Premiums (in thousands, except percentages)	Percentage of Total	
Restaurants	\$165,791	26.4	%
Automobile Service or Repair Shops	45,213	7.2	
Hotels, Motels, and Clubs	42,878	6.8	
Dentists, Optometrists, and Physicians	37,392	5.9	
Gasoline Stations	24,512	3.9	
Wholesale Stores	23,649	3.8	
Real Estate Management	19,639	3.1	
Apparel Manufacturing	18,581	3.0	
Groceries and Provisions	16,440	2.6	
Schools – Colleges and Religious Organizations	15,543	2.5	
Total	\$409,638	65.2	%

We currently write business in 31 states and the District of Columbia. Our business is concentrated in California, which makes the results of our operations more dependent on the trends that are unique to that state and that may differ from national trends. State legislation, local competition, economic and employment trends, and workers' compensation medical costs trends can be material to our financial results.

As of December 31, 2014, our policyholders had average annual in-force premiums of \$7,361. We are not dependent on any single policyholder and the loss of any single policyholder would not have a material adverse effect on our business.

Our in-force premiums and number of policies in-force were as follows as of December 31:

State	2014		2013		2012	
	In-force Premiums	Policies In-force	In-force Premiums	Policies In-force	In-force Premiums	Policies In-force
	(dollars in thousands)					
California	\$370,839	47,093	\$367,813	48,032	\$317,890	46,829
Other	257,062	38,209	249,611	36,024	219,452	32,985
Total	\$627,901	85,302	\$617,424	84,056	\$537,342	79,814

The following trends affected our workers' compensation business from 2012 through 2014:

- Total in-force premiums increased 16.9%, primarily due to an increasing number of policies in-force and higher premium rates, while California in-force premiums increased 16.7%; and

- Total policies in-force increased 6.9%, while policies in-force in California increased only 0.6%, reflecting our efforts to continue to diversify and grow our business in profitable markets.

We cannot be certain how these trends will ultimately impact our consolidated financial position and results of operations.

Our premiums are generally a function of the applicable premium rate, the amount of the insured's payroll, and if applicable, a factor reflecting the insured's historical loss experience (experience modification factor). Premium rates vary by state according to the nature of the employees' duties and the business of the employer. The premium is computed by applying the applicable premium rate to each class of the insured's payroll after it has been appropriately classified. Total policy premium is determined after applying an experience modification factor and a further adjustment, known as a schedule rating adjustment, and other adjustments, which may be made in certain circumstances, to increase or decrease the policy premium. Schedule rating adjustments are made based on individual risk characteristics of the insured and subject to maximum amounts as established in our premium rate filings.

Our premium rates are based upon actuarial analyses for each state in which we do business, except in "administered pricing" states, primarily Florida and Wisconsin, where premium rates are set by state insurance regulators.

In September 2012, the California legislature passed Senate Bill No. 863 (SB 863), which was subsequently signed into law. SB 863 includes a number of reforms to California's workers' compensation system, including increases to permanent disability benefits offset by reforms designed to reduce costs in the system; however, any cost savings associated with SB 863 will be dependent on the implementation of the provisions of the bill and are not included in our current rate filings. We do not anticipate any net savings associated with SB 863.

Our net rate (total in-force premiums divided by total insured payroll exposure) increased 11.2%, 12.9%, and 13.7% in California during the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013, and 2012, respectively. Net rate is a function of a variety of factors, including rate changes, underwriting risk profiles and pricing, and changes in business mix related to economic and competitive pressures. Pricing in California reflects changes to schedule rating, filed rates, and experience modifiers. We began leveraging territorial multipliers and multiple insurance subsidiaries, each with different rate filings, to provide additional pricing options in California for policies incepting on or after June 1, 2014.

Losses and LAE Reserves and Loss Development

We are directly liable for losses and LAE under the terms of the insurance policies our insurance subsidiaries write. Significant periods of time can elapse between the occurrence of an insured loss, the reporting of the loss to us and our payment of that loss. Loss reserves are reflected on our consolidated balance sheets under the line item caption "Unpaid losses and loss adjustment expenses." Estimating reserves is a complex process that involves a considerable degree of judgment by management and is inherently uncertain. Loss reserve estimates represent a significant risk to our business, which we attempt to mitigate by frequently and routinely reviewing loss cost trends.

For a detailed description of our reserves, the judgments, key assumptions and actuarial methodologies that we use to estimate our reserves, and the role of our consulting actuary, see "Item 7 –Management's Discussion and Analysis of Consolidated Financial Condition and Results of Operations –Critical Accounting Policies –Reserves for Losses and LAE" and Note 9 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements.

The following tables show changes in the historical loss reserves, on a gross basis and net of reinsurance, at December 31 for each of the 10 years prior to 2014 for EICN and ECIC, and for each of the years ended December 31, 2008 through December 31, 2013 for EPIC and EAC. This information is presented on a GAAP basis and the paid and reserve data is presented on a calendar year basis.

The top line of each table shows the net and gross reserves for unpaid losses and LAE recorded at each year-end. Such amount represents an estimate of unpaid losses and LAE occurring in that year as well as future payments on claims occurring in prior years. The upper portion of these tables (net and gross cumulative amounts paid, respectively) presents the cumulative amounts paid during subsequent years on those losses for which reserves were carried as of each specific year. The lower portions (net and gross reserves re-estimated, respectively) show the re-estimated amounts of the previously recorded reserves based on experience as of the end of each succeeding year. The re-estimated amounts change as more information becomes known about the actual losses for which the initial reserve was carried. An adjustment to the carrying value of unpaid losses for a prior year will also be reflected in the adjustments for each subsequent year. The gross cumulative redundancy (deficiency) line represents the cumulative change in estimates since the initial reserve was established. It is equal to the difference between the initial reserve and the latest re-estimated reserve amount. A redundancy means that the original estimate was higher than the current estimate. A deficiency means that the current estimate is higher than the original estimate.

Edgar Filing: Employers Holdings, Inc. - Form 10-K

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012 ⁽¹⁾	2013 ⁽¹⁾
Net reserves for losses and LAE	(in thousands)									
Originally estimated	\$1,089,814	\$1,208,481	\$1,209,652	\$1,217,069	\$1,430,128	\$1,373,153	\$1,323,686	\$1,331,523	\$1,426,154	\$1,587,000
Net cumulative amounts paid as of:										
One year later	96,661	106,859	109,129	127,912	214,499	206,653	218,569	225,541	261,729	319,680
Two years later	161,252	175,531	186,014	219,496	342,174	361,048	371,065	390,536	456,472	
Three years later	207,868	229,911	249,059	295,646	449,914	472,831	485,580	515,064		
Four years later	247,217	279,405	302,863	354,867	532,107	557,760	576,967			
Five years later	285,388	321,060	345,801	405,556	598,534	628,912				
Six years later	317,489	354,765	384,509	448,122	656,076					
Seven years later	344,968	384,899	417,572	484,662						
Eight years later	369,270	412,240	447,604							
Nine years later	392,492	437,317								
Ten years later	413,911									
Net reserves re-estimated as of:										
One year later	1,011,759	1,101,352	1,149,641	1,151,246	1,378,769	1,359,023	1,324,813	1,333,323	1,433,210	1,591,900
Two years later	975,765	1,049,628	1,085,358	1,100,706	1,352,021	1,340,366	1,313,064	1,334,008	1,429,769	
Three years later	954,660	1,004,589	1,035,028	1,079,913	1,319,989	1,324,835	1,312,313	1,329,580		
Four years later	927,382	970,671	1,010,407	1,046,648	1,303,044	1,305,228	1,302,506			
Five years later	900,588	949,446	973,921	1,038,650	1,277,675	1,291,339				
Six years later	883,388	917,843	962,798	1,004,408	1,263,661					
Seven years later	855,070	907,593	921,902	987,203						
Eight years later	849,217	869,828	904,062							
Nine years later	810,817	849,759								

Edgar Filing: Employers Holdings, Inc. - Form 10-K

Ten years later	793,229										
Net cumulative redundancy (deficiency):	296,585	358,722	305,590	229,866	166,467	81,814	21,180	1,943	(3,615)	(4,521)	
Gross reserves - December 31	2,284,542	2,349,981	2,307,755	2,269,710	2,506,478	2,425,658	2,279,729	2,272,363	2,231,540	2,330,400	
Reinsurance recoverable, gross	1,194,728	1,141,500	1,098,103	1,052,641	1,076,350	1,052,505	956,043	940,840	805,386	743,050	
Net reserves - December 31	1,089,814	1,208,481	1,209,652	1,217,069	1,430,128	1,373,153	1,323,686	1,331,523	1,426,154	1,587,350	
Gross re-estimated reserves	1,759,295	1,778,938	1,791,632	1,840,909	2,132,785	2,122,673	2,076,404	2,067,670	2,139,232	2,282,600	
Re-estimated reinsurance recoverables	966,066	929,179	887,570	853,706	869,124	831,334	773,898	738,090	709,463	690,730	
Net re-estimated reserves	793,229	849,759	904,062	987,203	1,263,661	1,291,339	1,302,506	1,329,580	1,429,769	1,591,870	
Gross reserves for losses and LAE Originally estimated	2,284,542	2,349,981	2,307,755	2,269,710	2,506,478	2,425,658	2,279,729	2,272,363	2,231,540	2,330,400	
Gross cumulative amounts paid as of:											
One year later	142,632	152,006	152,879	170,626	258,412	269,771	260,799	263,605	296,859	355,410	
Two years later	252,379	264,430	272,478	304,146	449,206	466,398	451,359	463,730	527,332		
Three years later	342,748	361,524	377,459	422,862	599,176	616,244	601,004	623,988			
Four years later	424,811	452,955	473,828	522,296	719,433	736,304	728,121				
Five years later	504,918	537,175	556,978	609,775	820,991	843,186					
Six years later	579,585	611,093	632,477	686,064	914,262						
Seven years later	647,276	677,472	699,264	754,248							
Eight years later	707,823	738,678	760,940								
Nine years later	764,910	795,399									
Ten years later	817,959										

Edgar Filing: Employers Holdings, Inc. - Form 10-K

Gross reserves										
re-estimated as of:										
One year later	2,178,514	2,233,077	2,233,176	2,200,689	2,470,746	2,373,479	2,299,653	2,164,595	2,196,051	2,282,6
Two years later	2,138,648	2,170,292	2,162,695	2,148,399	2,405,837	2,370,646	2,178,129	2,123,372	2,139,232	
Three years later	2,110,481	2,119,764	2,110,615	2,110,230	2,386,424	2,245,496	2,136,227	2,067,670		
Four years later	2,078,223	2,084,854	2,074,466	2,094,050	2,259,994	2,185,507	2,076,404			
Five years later	2,050,937	2,053,869	2,050,177	1,983,158	2,194,756	2,122,673				
Six years later	2,027,187	2,027,729	1,936,441	1,906,181	2,132,785					
Seven years later	2,001,243	1,918,261	1,857,243	1,840,909						
Eight years later	1,895,418	1,846,283	1,791,632							
Nine years later	1,824,090	1,778,938								
Ten years later	1,759,295									
Gross cumulative redundancy:	\$525,247	\$571,043	\$516,123	\$428,801	\$373,693	\$302,985	\$203,325	\$204,693	\$92,308	\$47,80

(1) The net cumulative deficiency at December 31, 2013 and 2012 included \$(4.6) million and \$(2.2) million, respectively, related to assigned risk business.

Reinsurance

Reinsurance is a transaction between insurance companies in which an original insurer, or ceding company, remits a portion of its premiums to a reinsurer, or assuming company, as payment for the reinsurer assuming a portion of the risk. Excess of loss reinsurance may be written in layers, in which a reinsurer or group of reinsurers accepts a band of coverage in excess of a specified amount, or retention, and up to a specified amount. Any liability exceeding the coverage limits of the reinsurance program is retained by the ceding company. The ceding company also bears the credit risk of a reinsurer's insolvency. Consistent with general industry practices, we purchase excess of loss reinsurance to protect against the impact of large individual, irregularly-occurring losses, and aggregate catastrophic losses from natural perils and terrorism, excluding nuclear, biological, chemical, and radiological events. Such reinsurance reduces the magnitude of such losses on our net income and the capital of our insurance subsidiaries.

Excess of Loss Reinsurance

Our current reinsurance program applies to all covered losses occurring between 12:01 a.m. July 1, 2014 and 12:01 a.m. July 1, 2015. The reinsurance program consists of one treaty covering excess of loss and catastrophic loss events in five layers of coverage. Our reinsurance coverage is \$195.0 million in excess of our \$5.0 million retention on a per occurrence basis, subject to a \$2.0 million annual aggregate deductible and certain exclusions. We are solely responsible for any losses we suffer above \$200.0 million except those covered by the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015 (TRIPRA of 2015). See "—Terrorism Risk Insurance Program." Covered losses which occur prior to expiration or cancellation of the agreement continue to be obligations of the subscribing reinsurers, subject to the other conditions in the agreement. The subscribing reinsurers may terminate the agreement only for our breach of the obligations of the agreement. We are responsible for the losses if the subscribing reinsurer cannot or refuses to pay.

The agreement includes certain exclusions for which our subscribing reinsurers are not liable for losses, including but not limited to losses arising from the following: reinsurance assumed by us under obligatory reinsurance agreements; financial guarantee and insolvency; certain nuclear risks; liability as a member, subscriber, or reinsurer of any pool, syndicate, or association, but not assigned risk plans; liability arising from participation or membership in any insolvency fund; loss or damage caused by war other than acts of terrorism or civil commotion; workers' compensation business covering persons employed in Minnesota; and any loss or damage caused by any act of terrorism involving biological, chemical, nuclear, or radioactive pollution or contamination. Our underwriting guidelines generally require that insured risks fall within the coverage provided in the reinsurance program. Executive review and approval would be required if we were to write risks outside the reinsurance program.

The agreement provides that we, or any subscribing reinsurer, may request commutation of any outstanding claim or claims 10 years after the effective date of termination or expiration of the agreements and provides a mechanism for the parties to achieve valuation for commutation. We may require a special commutation of the percentage share of any loss in the reinsurance program of any subscribing reinsurer that is in runoff.

LPT Agreement

In 1999, the Fund entered into a retroactive 100% quota share reinsurance agreement through a loss portfolio transfer transaction with third party reinsurers. The LPT Agreement commenced on June 30, 1999 and will remain in effect until all claims under the covered policies have closed, the agreement is commuted, or terminated, upon the mutual agreement of the parties, or the reinsurers' aggregate maximum limit of liability is exhausted, whichever occurs earlier. The LPT Agreement does not provide for any additional termination terms. On January 1, 2000, EICN assumed all of the assets, liabilities and operations of the Fund, including the Fund's rights and obligations associated with the LPT Agreement.

Under the LPT Agreement, the Fund initially ceded \$1.5 billion in liabilities for the incurred but unpaid losses and LAE related to claims incurred prior to July 1, 1995, for consideration of \$775.0 million in cash. The LPT Agreement, which ceded to the reinsurers substantially all of the Fund's outstanding losses as of June 30, 1999 for claims with original dates of injury prior to July 1, 1995, provides coverage for losses up to \$2.0 billion, excluding losses for burial and transportation expenses. The estimated remaining liabilities subject to the LPT Agreement were approximately \$534.8 million and \$612.1 million, as of December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively (See Note 10 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements). Losses and LAE paid with respect to the LPT Agreement totaled

approximately \$668.4 million and \$637.9 million through December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively.

The reinsurers agreed to assume responsibilities for the claims at the benefit levels which existed in June 1999. The LPT Agreement required each reinsurer to place assets supporting the payment of claims by them in a trust that requires collateral be held at a specified level. The level must not be less than the outstanding reserve for losses and a loss expense allowance equal to 7% of estimated paid losses discounted at a rate of 6%. If the assets held in trust fall below this threshold, we may require the reinsurers to contribute additional assets to maintain the required minimum level of collateral. The value of these assets as of December 31, 2014 and 2013 was \$1.5 billion and \$1.3 billion, respectively.

The reinsurers currently party to the LPT Agreement are ACE Bermuda Insurance Limited, XL Reinsurance Limited, and National Indemnity Company. The contract provides that during the term of the agreement all reinsurers need to maintain a rating of not less than “A-” (Excellent) as determined by A.M. Best. Currently, each of the reinsurers party to the LPT Agreement has a rating that satisfies this requirement.

We account for the LPT Agreement as retroactive reinsurance. Upon entry into the LPT Agreement, an initial deferred reinsurance gain was recorded as a liability on our consolidated balance sheet as Deferred reinsurance gain–LPT Agreement (Deferred Gain). We are also entitled to receive a contingent profit commission under the LPT Agreement. The contingent profit commission is estimated based on both actual paid results to date and projections of expected paid losses under the LPT Agreement. As of December 31, 2014, our estimate of ultimate expected contingent profit commission was \$62.7 million.

Recoverability of Reinsurance

Reinsurance makes the assuming reinsurer liable to the ceding company to the extent of the reinsurance; however, it does not discharge the ceding company from its primary liability to its policyholders in the event the reinsurer cannot or refuses to pay its obligations under such reinsurance. We monitor the financial strength of our reinsurers and do not believe that we are currently exposed to any material credit risk through our reinsurance arrangements because our reinsurance is recoverable from large, well-capitalized reinsurance companies. At December 31, 2014, \$1.5 billion was in trust accounts for reinsurance related to the LPT Agreement and an additional \$5.6 million, not related to the LPT Agreement, was collateralized by cash or letters of credit.

The following table provides certain information regarding our ceded reinsurance recoverables for losses and LAE as of December 31, 2014.

Reinsurer	A.M. Best Rating ⁽¹⁾	Total Losses and LAE Paid (in thousands)	Total Unpaid Losses and LAE	Total
ACE Bermuda Insurance Limited	A++	\$752	\$53,480	\$54,232
American Healthcare Indemnity Company	B++	10	1,844	1,854
Aspen Insurance UK Limited	A	33	7,267	7,300
Everest Reinsurance Company	A+	631	2,068	2,699
Finial Reinsurance	A-	12	3,035	3,047
Lloyds Syndicates	A+	42	59,021	59,063
Hannover Rueckversicherung-AG	A+	80	19,862	19,942
Markel Bermuda Ltd	A	518	2,994	3,512
Munich Reinsurance America, Inc	A+	739	7,106	7,845
National Indemnity Company	A++	4,133	294,141	298,274
National Union Fire Insurance Co of Pittsburg	A	56	1,493	1,549
Partner Reinsurance Europe plc	A+	467	1,403	1,870
Relia Star Life Insurance Company	A	62	1,920	1,982
Safety National Causality Corporation	A+	169	2,045	2,214
St Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Company	A++	18	3,119	3,137
Swiss Reinsurance America Corporation	A+	119	10,240	10,359
Tokio Marine & Nichido Fire Insurance Ltd (US)	A++	140	5,979	6,119
XL Re Limited	A	2,630	187,181	189,811
All Other	Various	52	5,283	5,335
Total		\$10,663	\$669,481	\$680,144

⁽¹⁾ A.M. Best's highest financial strength ratings for insurance companies are “A++” and “A+” (Superior), “A” and “A-” (Excellent), and “B++” and “B+” (Good).

We review the aging of our reinsurance recoverables on a quarterly basis. At December 31, 2014, less than 0.1% of our reinsurance recoverables on paid losses were greater than 90 days overdue.

Terrorism Risk Insurance Program

The Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (2002 Act) was initially enacted in November 2002, modified and extended in 2005, again in 2007, and most recently in 2015. Now known as the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015 (TRIPRA of 2015), the program is designed to allow the insurance industry and the federal government to share losses from declared terrorist events according to a specific formula, and is in effect until December 31, 2020.

The workers' compensation laws of the various states generally do not permit the exclusion of coverage for losses arising from terrorism or nuclear, biological, chemical, or radiological attacks. In addition, we are not able to limit our losses arising from any one catastrophe or from any one claimant. Our reinsurance policies exclude coverage for losses arising out of nuclear, biological, chemical or radiological attacks. Under TRIPRA of 2015, federal protection may be provided to the insurance industry for certain acts of foreign and domestic terrorism, including nuclear, biological, chemical or radiological attacks.

The impacts of any future terrorist acts are unpredictable, and the ultimate impact on our insurance subsidiaries, if any, of losses from any future terrorist acts will depend upon their nature, extent, location, and timing. We monitor the geographic concentration of our policyholders to help mitigate the risk of loss from terrorist acts.

Investments

As of December 31, 2014, the total amortized cost of our investment portfolio was \$2.3 billion and the fair value of the portfolio was \$2.4 billion. These investments provide a source of income, although short-term changes in interest rates and our current investment strategies affect the amount of investment income we earn and the fair value of our portfolio. Our investment strategy balances consideration of duration, yield, and credit risk.

We seek to maximize total investment returns within the constraints of prudent portfolio management. The asset allocation is reevaluated by the Finance Committee of the Board of Directors on a quarterly basis. We employ Conning Asset Management (Conning) as our independent investment manager. Conning follows our written investment guidelines based upon strategies approved by our Board of Directors. We also utilize Conning's investment advisory services. These services include investment accounting and company modeling using Dynamic Financial Analysis (DFA). The DFA tool is utilized in developing a tailored set of portfolio targets and objectives, which in turn, are used in constructing an optimal portfolio.

Additional information regarding our investment portfolio, including our approach to managing investment risk, is set forth under "Item 7 –Management's Discussion and Analysis of Consolidated Financial Condition and Results of Operations –Liquidity and Capital Resources –Investments" and "Item 7A –Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk."

Marketing and Distribution

We market our workers' compensation insurance products through independent local, regional, and national agents and brokers and through alternative distribution channels, including our partner ADP, Inc. (ADP) and national, regional, and local trade groups and associations.

Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers

We establish and maintain strong, long-term relationships with independent insurance agencies that actively market our products and services. We offer ease of doing business, provide responsive service, and pay competitive commissions. Our sales representatives and underwriters work closely with independent agencies to market and underwrite our business. This results in enhanced understanding of the businesses and risks we underwrite and the needs of prospective customers. We do not delegate underwriting authority to agents or brokers. We are not dependent on any one agency and the loss of any one agency would not be material.

We had 4,795 independent agencies that marketed and sold our insurance products at December 31, 2014.

Independent agencies generated 76.2%, 76.7%, and 77.0% of in-force premiums at December 31, 2014, 2013, and 2012, respectively, and our largest agency generated 1.0% of in-force premiums at each of December 31, 2014, 2013, and 2012.

Alternative Distribution Channels

We have developed and continue to add to important distribution channels for our products and services that serves as an alternative to our strong independent agency distribution channel. These alternative distribution channels utilize partnerships and alliances with entities such as payroll companies and health care and property and casualty insurers for which we provide workers' compensation insurance coverage. Our small business, low to medium hazard workers' compensation insurance products are jointly offered and marketed with and through our partners and alliances.

Alternative distribution channels generated 23.6%, 23.0%, and 22.6% of our in-force premiums as of December 31, 2014, 2013, and 2012, respectively.

In 2014, a concentration of our business was generated by ADP. ADP is the largest payroll services provider in the United States servicing small and medium-sized businesses. As part of its services, ADP sells our workers' compensation insurance product along with its payroll and accounting services through its insurance agency and field sales staff primarily to small businesses. ADP generated 11.3%, 10.7%, and 10.3% of our in-force premiums as of December 31, 2014, 2013, and 2012, respectively. The majority of this business is written through ADP's small business unit, which has accounts of 1 to 50 employees. We pay ADP fees that are a percentage of premiums received for services provided through the ADP program.

Our relationship with ADP is non-exclusive; however, we believe we are a key partner of ADP for our selected markets and classes of business. Our agreement with ADP may be terminated at any time by either party without cause upon 120 days notice.

Competition and Market Conditions

The insurance industry is highly competitive, and there is significant competition in the national workers' compensation industry that is based on price and quality of services. We compete with other specialty workers' compensation carriers, state agencies, multi-line insurance companies, professional employer organizations, third-party administrators, self-insurance funds, and state insurance pools. Many of our competitors are significantly larger, are more widely known, and/or possess considerably greater financial resources. Our primary competitors in California are AmTrust Financial Services, Inc., Berkshire Hathaway Homestate Companies, California State Compensation Insurance Fund, The Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc., ICW Group, and Travelers Insurance Group Holdings, Inc.

The workers' compensation sector continued to see average medical and indemnity claims costs increase in 2013, the most recent year for which industry data is available. We continue to have concerns related to the volatility and uncertainty in the financial markets and economic conditions generally.

In California, the Workers' Compensation Insurance Rating Bureau (WCIRB) noted a continued increase in indemnity claim frequency for the first half of 2014, unlike other states where frequency continues to decline. The WCIRB attributed this increase to late reported claims, cumulative injuries, increased benefits associated with SB 863, geographic and socioeconomic differences related to higher claim rates in Southern California, and other demographics, including a less experienced workforce.

Regulation

State Insurance Regulation

Insurance companies are subject to regulation and supervision by the insurance regulator in the state in which they are domiciled and, to a lesser extent, other states in which they conduct business. Our insurance subsidiaries are subject to regulation by the states in which our insurance subsidiaries are domiciled or transact business. These state agencies have broad regulatory, supervisory, and administrative powers, including among other things, the power to grant and revoke licenses to transact business, license agencies, set the standards of solvency to be met and maintained, determine the nature of, and limitations on, investments and dividends, approve policy forms and rates in some states, periodically examine financial statements, determine the form and content of required financial statements, set the rates that we may charge in some states, and periodically examine market conduct.

Detailed annual and quarterly financial statements, prepared in accordance with statutory accounting principles (SAP), and other reports are required to be filed with the insurance regulator in each of the states in which we are licensed to transact business. The California Department of Insurance (California DOI), Florida Office of Insurance Regulation (Florida OIR), and Nevada Division of Insurance (Nevada DOI) periodically examine the statutory financial statements of their respective domiciliary insurance companies. In 2012, the California DOI, Florida OIR, and Nevada DOI completed financial examinations for ECIC, EPIC and EAC, and EICN, respectively. There were no material findings. The California DOI, Florida OIR, and Nevada DOI have initiated the next regularly scheduled exams of each of our four insurance subsidiaries.

Many states have laws and regulations that limit an insurer's ability to withdraw from a particular market. For example, states may limit an insurer's ability to cancel or not renew policies. Furthermore, certain states prohibit an insurer from withdrawing one or more lines of business from the state, except pursuant to a plan that is approved by the state insurance regulator. The state insurance regulator may disapprove a plan that may lead to market disruption. We are subject to laws and regulations of this type, and these laws and regulations may restrict our ability to exit unprofitable markets.

Holding Company Regulation. Nearly all states have enacted legislation that regulates insurance holding company systems. Each insurance company in a holding company system is required to register with the insurance regulator of its state of domicile and furnish information concerning the operations of companies within the holding company system that may materially affect the operations, management or financial condition of the insurers within the system. All transactions within a holding company system affecting an insurer must have fair and reasonable terms, the

charges or fees for services performed must be reasonable, the insurer's total statutory surplus following any transaction must be both reasonable in relation to its outstanding liabilities and adequate for its needs, and are subject to other standards and requirements established by law and regulation. Notice to state insurance regulators is required prior to the consummation of certain affiliated and other transactions involving our insurance subsidiaries and such transactions may be disapproved by the state insurance regulators.

Pursuant to applicable insurance holding company laws, EICN is required to register with the Nevada DOI, ECIC is required to register with the California DOI, and EPIC and EAC are required to register with the Florida OIR. Under these laws, the respective state insurance departments may examine us at any time, require disclosure of material transactions and require prior notice for, or approval of, certain transactions.

Change of Control. Our insurance subsidiaries are domiciled in Florida, California and Nevada. The insurance laws of these states generally require that any person seeking to acquire control of a domestic insurance company obtain the prior approval of the state's insurance commissioner. In Florida, "control" is generally presumed to exist through the direct or indirect ownership of 5% or more of the voting securities of a domestic insurance company or of any entity that controls a domestic insurance company. In California and Nevada, "control" is presumed to exist through the direct or indirect ownership of 10% or more of the voting securities of a domestic insurance company or of any entity that controls a domestic insurance company. In addition, insurance laws in many states in which we are licensed require pre-notification to the state's insurance commissioner of a change in control of a non-domestic insurance company licensed in those states.

Statutory Accounting and Solvency Regulations. State insurance regulators closely monitor the financial condition of insurance companies reflected in financial statements based on SAP and can impose significant financial and operating restrictions on an insurance company that becomes financially impaired under SAP guidelines. State insurance regulators can generally impose restrictions or conditions on the activities of a financially impaired insurance company, including: the transfer or disposition of assets; the withdrawal of funds from bank accounts; payment of dividends or other distributions; the extension of credit or the advancement of loans; and investments of funds, including business acquisitions or combinations.

Financial, Dividend, and Investment Restrictions. State laws require insurance companies to maintain minimum levels of surplus and place limits on the amount of premiums a company may write based on the amount of that company's surplus. These limitations may restrict the rate at which our insurance operations can grow.

State laws also require insurance companies to establish reserves for payments of policyholder liabilities and impose restrictions on the kinds of assets in which insurance companies may invest. These restrictions may require us to invest in assets more conservatively than we would if we were not subject to state law restrictions and may prevent us from obtaining as high a return on our assets as we might otherwise be able to realize absent the restrictions.

The ability of EHI to pay dividends on our common stock and to pay other expenses will be dependent to a significant extent upon the ability of EICN and EPIC to pay dividends to their immediate holding company, Employers Group, Inc. (EGI) and, in turn, the ability of EGI to pay dividends to EHI. Additional information regarding financial, dividend, and investment restrictions is set forth in Note 15 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements.

Insurance Assessments. All of the states where our insurance subsidiaries are licensed to transact business require property and casualty insurers doing business within the state to pay various insurance assessments. We accrue a liability for estimated insurance assessments as direct premiums are written, losses are recorded, or as other events occur in accordance with various states' laws and regulations, and defer these costs and recognize them as an expense as the related premiums are earned. Various mechanisms exist in some of these states for assessed insurance companies to recover certain assessments. Additional information regarding insurance assessments is set forth in Note 12 to our Consolidated Financial Statements.

Pooling Arrangements. As a condition to conduct business in some states, insurance companies are required to participate in mandatory workers' compensation shared market mechanisms, or pooling arrangements, which provide workers' compensation insurance coverage to private businesses that are otherwise unable to obtain coverage due, for example, to their prior loss experiences.

The National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC). The NAIC is a group formed by state insurance regulators to discuss issues and formulate policy with respect to regulation, reporting, and accounting of and by U.S. insurance companies. Although the NAIC has no legislative authority and insurance companies are at all times subject to the laws of their respective domiciliary states and, to a lesser extent, other states in which they conduct business, the NAIC is influential in determining the form in which insurance laws are enacted. Model Insurance Laws, Regulations, and Guidelines (Model Laws) have been promulgated by the NAIC as a minimum standard by which state regulatory systems and regulations are measured. Adoption of state laws that provide for substantially similar regulations to those described in the Model Laws is a requirement for accreditation of state insurance regulatory agencies by the NAIC.

Under the Model Laws, insurers are required to maintain minimum levels of capital based on their investments and operations. These risk-based capital (RBC) requirements provide a standard by which regulators can assess the adequacy of an insurance company's capital and surplus relative to its operations. An insurance company must

maintain capital and surplus of at least 200% of the RBC computed by the NAIC's RBC model, known as the "Authorized Control Level" of RBC. At December 31, 2014, each of our insurance subsidiaries had total adjusted capital in excess of the minimum RBC requirements.

The key financial ratios of the NAIC's Insurance Regulatory Information System (IRIS) were developed to assist state regulators in overseeing the financial condition of insurance companies. These ratios are reviewed by financial examiners of the NAIC and state insurance regulators for the purposes of detecting financial distress and preventing insolvency and to select those companies that merit highest priority in the allocation of the regulators' resources. IRIS identifies 13 key financial ratios and specifies a "usual range" for each. Departure from the usual ranges on four or more of the ratios can lead to inquiries from individual state insurance

regulators as to certain aspects of an insurer's business. None of our insurance subsidiaries are currently subject to any action by any state regulator with respect to IRIS ratios.

Item 1A. Risk Factors

Investing in our common stock involves risks. In evaluating our company, you should carefully consider the risks described below, together with all the information included or incorporated by reference in this report. The risks facing our company include, but are not limited to, those described below. Additional risks that we are not presently aware of or that we currently believe are immaterial may also impair our business operations. The occurrence of one or more of these events could significantly and adversely affect our business, financial condition, results of operations, cash flows, and stock price, and you could lose all or part of your investment.

Our liability for losses and LAE is based on estimates and may be inadequate to cover our actual losses and expenses. We must establish and maintain reserves for our estimated losses and LAE. We establish loss reserves in our financial statements that represent an estimate of amounts needed to pay and administer claims with respect to insured claims that have occurred, including claims that have occurred but have not yet been reported to us. Loss reserves are estimates of the ultimate cost of individual claims based on actuarial estimation techniques, are inherently uncertain, and do not represent an exact measure of liability.

Several factors contribute to the uncertainty in establishing estimated losses, including the length of time to settle long-term, severe cases, claim cost inflation (deflation) trends, and uncertainties in the long-term outcome of legislative reforms. Judgment is required in applying actuarial techniques to determine the relevance of historical payment and claim settlement patterns under current facts and circumstances. In certain states, we have a relatively short operating history and must rely on a combination of industry experience and our specific experience regarding claims emergence and payment patterns, medical cost inflation, and claim cost trends, adjusted for future anticipated changes in claims-related and economic trends, as well as regulatory and legislative changes, to establish our best estimate of reserves for losses and LAE. As we receive new information and update our assumptions over time regarding the ultimate liability, our loss reserves may prove to be inadequate to cover our actual losses, and we have in the past made, and may in the future make, adjustments to our reserves based on a number of factors. Any changes in these estimates could be material and could have an adverse effect on our results of operations and financial condition during the period the changes are made.

The insurance business is subject to extensive regulation and legislative changes, which impact the manner in which we operate our business.

Our insurance business is subject to extensive regulation by the applicable state agencies in the jurisdictions in which we operate, most significantly by the insurance regulators in California, Florida, and Nevada, the states in which our insurance subsidiaries are domiciled. As of December 31, 2014, over one-half of our in-force premiums were generated in California. Accordingly, we are particularly affected by regulation in California. The passage of any form of rate regulation in California could impair our ability to operate profitably in California, and any such impairment could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition and results of operations.

More generally, insurance regulators have broad regulatory powers designed to protect policyholders and claimants, and not stockholders or other investors. Regulations vary from state to state, but typically address or include:

- standards of solvency, including RBC measurements;
- restrictions on the nature, quality, and concentration of investments;
- restrictions on the types of terms that we can include in the insurance policies we offer;
- mandates that may affect wage replacement and medical care benefits paid under the workers' compensation system;
- requirements for the handling and reporting of claims and procedures for adjusting claims;
- restrictions on the way rates are developed and premiums are determined;
- the manner in which agents may be appointed;
- establishment of liabilities for unearned premiums, unpaid losses and LAE, and for other purposes;
- limitations on our ability to transact business with affiliates;
- mergers, acquisitions, and divestitures involving our insurance subsidiaries;
- licensing requirements and approvals that affect our ability to do business;
- compliance with all applicable privacy laws;

potential assessments for the settlement of covered claims under insurance policies issued by impaired, insolvent, or failed insurance companies or other assessments imposed by regulatory agencies; and the amount of dividends that our insurance subsidiaries may pay to EGI and, in turn, the ability of EGI to pay dividends to EHI.

Workers' compensation insurance is statutorily provided for in all of the states in which we do business. State laws and regulations specify the form and content of policy coverage and the rights and benefits that are available to injured workers, their representatives,

and medical providers. In “administered pricing” states, insurance rates are set by the state insurance regulators and are adjusted periodically. Rate competition is generally not permitted in these states. Of the states in which we currently operate, Florida, Wisconsin, and Idaho are administered pricing states. Additionally, we are exposed to the risk that other states in which we operate will adopt administered pricing laws.

Legislation and regulation impact our ability to investigate fraud and other abuses of the workers' compensation system in the states in which we do business. Our relationships with medical providers are also impacted by legislation and regulation, including penalties for failure to make timely payments.

Federal legislation typically does not directly impact our workers' compensation business, but our business can be indirectly affected by changes in healthcare, occupational safety and health, and tax and financial regulations. Since healthcare costs are the largest component of our loss costs, we may be impacted by changes in healthcare legislation, such as the ongoing implementation of the Affordable Care Act, which could effect healthcare costs and delivery in the future. There is also the possibility of federal regulation of insurance.

This extensive regulation of our business may affect the cost or demand for our products and may limit our ability to obtain rate increases or to take other actions that we might desire to maintain our profitability. In addition, we may be unable to maintain all required approvals or comply fully with applicable laws and regulations, or the relevant governmental authority's interpretation of such laws and regulations. If that were to occur, we might lose our ability to conduct business in certain jurisdictions. Further, changes in the level of regulation of the insurance industry or changes in laws or regulations or interpretations by regulatory authorities could impact our operations, require us to bear additional costs of compliance, and impact our profitability.

If we fail to price our insurance policies appropriately, our business competitiveness, financial condition, and results of operations could be materially adversely affected.

Premiums are based on the particular class of business and our estimates of expected losses and LAE and other expenses related to the policies we underwrite. We analyze many factors when pricing a policy, including the policyholder's prior loss history and industry classification. Inaccurate information regarding a policyholder's past claims experience could put us at risk for mispricing our policies, which could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, and results of operations. For example, when initiating coverage on a policyholder, we must rely on the information provided by the policyholder or the policyholder's previous insurer(s) to properly estimate future claims expense. In order to set premium rates accurately, we must utilize an appropriate pricing model which correctly assesses risks based on their individual characteristics and takes into account actual and projected industry characteristics.

Our concentration in California ties our performance to the business, economic, demographic, natural perils, competitive, and regulatory conditions in that state.

Our business is concentrated in California, where we generated 59% of our in-force premiums as of December 31, 2014. Accordingly, the loss environment and unfavorable business, economic, demographic, natural perils, competitive, and regulatory conditions in California could negatively impact our business.

California has been greatly affected by the overall economic downturn and tightening of the credit markets. Since 2009, the economic condition of the state has resulted in decreased payrolls. In addition, many California businesses are dependent on tourism revenues, which are, in turn, dependent on a robust economy. The downturn in the national economy and the economy of California, or any other event that causes deterioration in tourism, could adversely impact small businesses, such as restaurants, that we have targeted as customers. The departure from California or insolvency of a significant number of small businesses could also have a material adverse effect on our financial condition and results of operations. California is also exposed to climate and environmental changes, natural perils such as earthquakes, and susceptible to the possibility of pandemics or terrorist acts. Accordingly, we could suffer losses as a result of catastrophic events in this state. Additionally, the workers' compensation industry has seen an increase in claims litigation in California. Because of the concentration of our business in California, we may be exposed to losses and business, economic, and regulatory risks or risk from natural perils that are greater than the risks associated with companies with greater geographic diversification.

We rely on independent insurance agents and brokers.

We market and sell our insurance products primarily through independent, non-exclusive insurance agents and brokers. These agents and brokers are not obligated to promote our products and can and do sell our competitors' products. In addition, these agents and brokers may find it easier to promote the broader range of programs of some of our competitors than to promote our single-line workers' compensation insurance products. The loss of a number of our independent agents and brokers or the failure or inability of these agents to successfully market our insurance programs could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, and results of operations.

We rely on relationships with our principal distribution partner.

We have an agreement with our principal distribution partner, ADP, to market and service our insurance products through its sales forces and insurance agencies. ADP generated 11.3% of our total in-force premiums as of December 31, 2014. Our agreement with ADP is not exclusive, and ADP may terminate the agreement without cause upon 120 days notice. The termination of this agreement, our failure to maintain a good relationship with ADP, or its failure to successfully market our products may materially reduce our revenues and could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations. In addition, we are subject to the risk that ADP may face financial difficulties, reputational issues, or problems with respect to its own products and services, which may lead to decreased sales of our products and services. Moreover, if ADP consolidates or aligns itself with another company or changes its products that are currently offered with our workers' compensation insurance products, we may lose business or suffer decreased revenues.

We are also subject to credit risk with respect to ADP, as it collects premiums on our behalf for the workers' compensation products that are marketed together with its own products. Any failure to remit such premiums to us or to remit such amounts on a timely basis could have an adverse effect on our results of operations.

A downgrade in our financial strength rating could reduce the amount of business that we are able to write or result in the termination of certain of our agreements with our strategic partners.

Rating agencies rate insurance companies based on financial strength as an indication of an ability to pay claims. Our insurance subsidiaries are currently assigned a group letter rating of "A-" (Excellent) by A.M. Best, which is the rating agency that we believe has the most influence on our business. This rating is assigned to companies that, in the opinion of A.M. Best, have demonstrated an excellent overall performance when compared to industry standards. A.M. Best considers "A-" (Excellent) rated companies to have an excellent ability to meet their ongoing obligations to policyholders. This rating does not refer to our ability to meet non-insurance obligations.

The financial strength ratings of A.M. Best and other rating agencies are subject to periodic review using, among other things, proprietary capital adequacy models, and are subject to revision or withdrawal at any time. Insurance financial strength ratings are directed toward the concerns of policyholders and insurance agents and are not intended for the protection of investors or as a recommendation to buy, hold, or sell securities. Our competitive position relative to other companies is determined in part by our financial strength rating. A reduction in our A.M. Best rating could adversely affect the amount of business we could write, as well as our relationships with independent agents and brokers and strategic partners.

In view of the difficulties experienced recently by many financial institutions, including some of our competitors in the insurance industry, we believe that it is possible that external rating agencies, such as A.M. Best, may increase their scrutiny of financial institutions, increase the frequency and scope of their reviews, request additional information from the companies that they rate, including additional information regarding the valuation of investment securities held, and may adjust upward the capital and other requirements employed in their models for maintenance of certain rating levels. We cannot predict what actions rating agencies may take, or what actions we may take in response to the actions of rating agencies.

If we are unable to obtain reinsurance or collect on ceded reinsurance, our ability to write new policies and to renew existing policies could be adversely affected and our financial condition and results of operations could be materially adversely affected.

At December 31, 2014, we had \$680 million of reinsurance recoverables for paid and unpaid losses and LAE, of which \$11 million was due to us on paid claims.

We purchase reinsurance to protect us against the costs of severe claims and catastrophic events, including natural perils and acts of terrorism, excluding nuclear, biological, chemical, and radiological events. On July 1, 2014, we entered into a new reinsurance program that is effective through June 30, 2015. The reinsurance program consists of one treaty covering excess of loss and catastrophic loss events in five layers of coverage. Our reinsurance coverage is \$195 million in excess of our \$5 million retention on a per occurrence basis, subject to a \$2 million annual aggregate deductible and certain exclusions.

The availability, amount, and cost of reinsurance depend on market conditions and our loss experience and may vary significantly. We cannot be certain that our reinsurance agreements will be renewed or replaced prior to their

expiration upon terms satisfactory to us. If we are unable to renew or replace our reinsurance agreements upon terms satisfactory to us, our net liability on individual risks would increase and we would have greater exposure to large and catastrophic losses, which could have a material adverse affect on our financial condition and results of operations. In addition, we are subject to credit risk with respect to our reinsurers, and they may refuse to pay or delay payment of losses we cede to them. We remain liable to our policyholders even if we are unable to make recoveries that we believe we are entitled to under our reinsurance contracts. Losses may not be recovered from our reinsurers until claims are paid and, in the case of long-term workers' compensation cases, the creditworthiness of our reinsurers may change before we can recover amounts that we are entitled to. The inability of any of our reinsurers to meet their financial obligations could have a material adverse affect on our financial condition and results of operations.

We obtained reinsurance covering the losses incurred prior to July 1, 1995, and we could be liable for all of those losses if the coverage provided by the LPT Agreement proves inadequate or we fail to collect from the reinsurers that are party to such transaction.

On January 1, 2000, EICN assumed all of the assets, liabilities, and operations of the Fund, including losses incurred by the Fund prior to such date. EICN also assumed the Fund's rights and obligations associated with the LPT Agreement that the Fund entered into with third party reinsurers with respect to its losses incurred prior to July 1, 1995, see "Item 1 –Business –Reinsurance –LPT Agreement." We could be liable for all of those losses if the coverage provided by the LPT Agreement proves inadequate or we fail to collect from the reinsurers party to such transaction. As of December 31, 2014, the estimated remaining liabilities subject to the LPT Agreement were \$535 million. If we are unable to collect on these reinsurance recoverables, our financial condition and results of operations could be materially adversely affected.

The reinsurers under the LPT Agreement agreed to assume responsibilities for the claims at the benefit levels which existed in June 1999. Accordingly, if the Nevada legislature were to increase the benefits payable for the pre-July 1, 1995 claims, we would be responsible for the increased benefit costs to the extent of the legislative increase. If the credit rating of any of the third party reinsurers that are party to the LPT Agreement were to fall below "A–" (Excellent) as determined by A.M. Best or one of the reinsurers becomes insolvent, we would be responsible for replacing any such reinsurer or would be liable for the claims that otherwise would have been transferred to such reinsurer. For example, in 2002, the rating of one of the original reinsurers under the LPT Agreement, Gerling Global International Reinsurance Company Ltd. (Gerling), dropped below the mandatory "A–" (Excellent) rating to "B+" (Good). Accordingly, we entered into an agreement to replace Gerling with National Indemnity Company at a cost to us of \$33 million. We can give no assurance that circumstances requiring us to replace one or more of the current reinsurers under the LPT Agreement will not occur in the future, that we will be successful in replacing such reinsurer or reinsurers in such circumstances, or that the cost of such replacement or replacements will not have a material adverse effect on our results of operations or financial condition.

The LPT Agreement also required the reinsurers to each place assets supporting the payment of claims by them in individual trusts that require that collateral be held at a specified level. The collateralization level must not be less than the outstanding reserve for losses and a loss expense allowance equal to 7% of estimated paid losses discounted at a rate of 6%. If the assets held in trust fall below this threshold, we can require the reinsurers to contribute additional assets to maintain the required minimum level. The value of these assets at December 31, 2014 was \$1.5 billion. If the value of the collateral in the trusts drops below the required minimum level and the reinsurers are unable to contribute additional assets, we could be responsible for substituting a new reinsurer or paying those claims without the benefit of reinsurance. One of the reinsurers has collateralized its obligations under the LPT Agreement by placing shares of stock of a publicly held corporation, with a value of \$1.3 billion at December 31, 2014, in a trust to secure the reinsurer's obligation of \$294 million. The value of this collateral is subject to fluctuations in the market price of such stock. The other reinsurers have placed treasury and fixed maturity securities in trusts to collateralize their obligations. Intense competition and the fact that we write only a single line of insurance could adversely affect our ability to sell policies at rates we deem adequate.

The market for workers' compensation insurance products is highly competitive. Competition in our business is based on many factors, including premiums charged, services provided, financial ratings assigned by independent rating agencies, speed of claims payments, reputation, policyholder dividends, perceived financial strength, and general experience. In some cases, our competitors offer lower priced products than we do. If our competitors offer more competitive premiums, policyholder dividends, or payment plans, services or commissions to independent agents, brokers, and other distributors, we could lose market share or have to reduce our premium rates, which could adversely affect our profitability. We compete with regional and national insurance companies, professional employer organizations, third-party administrators, self-insured employers, and state insurance funds. Our main competitors vary from state to state, but are usually those companies that offer a full range of services in underwriting, loss control, and claims. We compete on the basis of the services that we offer to our policyholders and on ease of doing business rather than solely on price.

Many of our competitors are significantly larger and possess greater financial, marketing, and management resources than we do. Some of our competitors benefit financially by not being subject to federal income tax. Intense competitive pressure on prices can result from the actions of even a single large competitor. Competitors with more surplus than us have the potential to expand in our markets more quickly than we can. Greater financial resources also permit an insurer to gain market share through more competitive pricing, even if that pricing results in reduced underwriting margins or an underwriting loss.

Many of our competitors are multi-line carriers that can price the workers' compensation insurance they offer at a loss in order to obtain other lines of business at a profit. This creates a competitive disadvantage for us, as we only offer a single line of insurance. For example, a business may find it more efficient or less expensive to purchase multiple lines of commercial insurance coverage from a single carrier.

The property and casualty insurance industry is cyclical in nature and is characterized by periods of so-called "soft" market conditions, in which premium rates are stable or falling, insurance is readily available, and insurers' profits decline, and by periods

of so-called “hard” market conditions, in which rates rise, insurance may be more difficult to find, and insurers' profits increase. According to the Insurance Information Institute, since 1970, the property and casualty insurance industry experienced hard market conditions from 1975 to 1978, 1984 to 1987, and 2001 to 2004. Although the financial performance of an individual insurance company is dependent on its own specific business characteristics, the profitability of most workers' compensation insurance companies generally tends to follow this cyclical market pattern. We believe the workers' compensation industry currently has excess underwriting capacity resulting in lower rate levels and smaller profit margins. We continue to experience price competition in our target markets.

Because of cyclical in the workers' compensation market, due in large part to competition, capacity, and general economic factors, we cannot predict the timing or duration of changes in the market cycle. This cyclical pattern has in the past and could in the future adversely affect our financial condition and results of operations. If we are unable to compete effectively, our business, financial condition, and results of operations could be materially adversely affected. We may be unable to realize our investment objectives and economic conditions in the financial markets could lead to investment losses.

Investment income is an important component of our revenue and net income. Our investment portfolio is managed by an independent asset manager that operates under investment guidelines approved by our Board of Directors.

Although these guidelines stress diversification and capital preservation, our investments are subject to a variety of risks that are beyond our control, including risks related to general economic conditions, interest rate fluctuations, and market volatility. Interest rates are highly sensitive to many factors, including governmental monetary policies and domestic and international economic and political conditions. These and other factors affect the capital markets and, consequently, the value of our investment portfolio.

We are exposed to significant financial risks related to the capital markets, including the risk of potential economic loss principally arising from adverse changes in the fair value of financial instruments. The major components of market risk affecting us are interest rate risk, credit risk, and equity price risk. For more information regarding market risk, see "Item 7A—Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk."

The outlook for our investment income is dependent on the future direction of interest rates, maturity schedules, and cash flow from operations that is available for investment. The fair values of fixed maturity securities that are “available-for-sale” fluctuate with changes in interest rates and cause fluctuations in our stockholders' equity. Any significant decline in our investment income or the value of our investments as a result of changes in interest rates, deterioration in the credit of companies or municipalities in which we have invested, decreased dividend payments, general market conditions, or events that have an adverse impact on any particular industry or geographic region in which we hold significant investments could have an adverse effect on our net income and, as a result, on our stockholders' equity and policyholder surplus.

The valuation of our investments, including the determination of the amount of impairments, include estimates and assumptions and could result in changes to investment valuations that may adversely affect our financial condition and results of operations. The use of internally developed valuation techniques may have a material effect on the estimated fair value amounts of our investments and our financial condition.

Additionally, we regularly review our entire investment portfolio, including the identification of other-than-temporary declines in fair value. The determination of the amount of impairments taken on our investments is based on our periodic evaluation and assessment of our investments and known and inherent risks associated with the various asset classes. There can be no assurance that we have accurately determined the level of other-than-temporary impairments reflected in our financial statements and additional impairments may need to be taken in the future. Historical trends may not be indicative of future impairments.

We may require additional capital in the future, which may not be available to us or may be available only on unfavorable terms.

Our future capital requirements will depend on many factors, including state regulatory requirements, our ability to write new business successfully, and to establish premium rates and reserves at levels sufficient to cover losses. If we have to raise additional capital, equity or debt financing may not be available on terms that are favorable to us. In the case of equity financings, there could be dilution to our stockholders and the securities may have rights, preferences, and privileges senior to our common stock. In the case of debt financings, we may be subject to covenants that restrict

our ability to freely operate our business. If we cannot obtain adequate capital on favorable terms or at all, we may be unable to implement our future growth or operating plans and our business, financial condition, and results of operations could be materially adversely affected.

The capital and credit markets continue to experience volatility and disruption that have negatively affected market liquidity conditions. In some cases, the markets have produced downward pressure on stock prices and limited the availability of credit for certain issuers without regard to those issuers' underlying financial strength. As a result, we may be forced to delay raising capital or be unable to raise capital on favorable terms, or at all, which could decrease our profitability, significantly reduce our financial flexibility, and cause rating agencies to reevaluate our financial strength ratings.

We are a holding company with no direct operations. We depend on the ability of our subsidiaries to transfer funds to us to meet our obligations, and our insurance subsidiaries' ability to pay dividends to us is restricted by law.

EHI is a holding company that transacts substantially all of its business through operating subsidiaries. Its primary assets are the shares of stock of our insurance subsidiaries. The ability of EHI to meet obligations on outstanding debt, to pay stockholder dividends, and to make other payments depends on the surplus and earnings of our subsidiaries and their ability to pay dividends or to advance or repay funds, and upon the ability of our insurance subsidiaries to pay dividends to EGI and, in turn, the ability of EGI to pay dividends to EHI.

Payments of dividends by our insurance subsidiaries are restricted by state insurance laws, including laws establishing minimum solvency and liquidity thresholds, and could be subject to contractual restrictions in the future, including those imposed by indebtedness we may incur in the future. As a result, we may not be able to receive dividends from these subsidiaries and we may not receive dividends in the amounts necessary to meet our obligations or to pay dividends on our common stock.

We have outstanding indebtedness, which could impair our financial strength ratings and adversely affect our ability to react to changes in our business and fulfill our debt obligations.

Our indebtedness could have significant consequences, including:

- making it more difficult for us to satisfy our financial obligations;
- limiting our ability to borrow additional amounts to fund working capital, capital expenditures, debt service requirements, the execution of our business strategy, acquisitions, and other purposes;
- affecting the way we manage our business due to restrictive covenants;
- requiring us to provide collateral which restricts our use of funds;
- requiring us to use a portion of our cash flow from operations to pay principal and interest on our debt; and
- making us more vulnerable to adverse changes in general economic and industry conditions, and limiting our flexibility to plan for, and react quickly to, changing conditions.

We rely on our information technology and telecommunication systems, and the failure of these systems or cyber attacks on our systems could materially and adversely affect our business.

Our business is highly dependent upon the successful and uninterrupted functioning of our information technology and telecommunications systems. We rely on these systems to process new and renewal business, provide customer service, administer and make payments on claims, facilitate collections, and to automatically underwrite and administer the policies we write. The failure of any of our systems could interrupt our operations or materially impact our ability to evaluate and write new business. Our information technology and telecommunications systems interface with and depend on third-party systems, and we could experience service denials if demand for such services exceeds capacity or such third-party systems fail or experience interruptions.

Certain events outside of our control, including cyber attacks on our systems, could render our systems inoperable such that we would be unable to service our agents, insureds, and injured workers, or meet certain regulatory requirements. If such an event were to occur and our systems were unable to be restored or secured within a reasonable timeframe, our business, financial condition, and results of operations could be adversely affected.

Additionally, cyber attacks resulting in a breach of security could jeopardize the privacy, confidentiality, and integrity of our data or our customers' data, which could harm our reputation and expose us to possible liability.

Acts of terrorism and catastrophes could materially adversely impact our financial condition and results of operations. Under our workers' compensation policies and applicable laws in the states in which we operate, we are required to provide workers' compensation benefits for losses arising from acts of terrorism. The impact of any terrorist act is unpredictable, and the ultimate impact on us would depend upon the nature, extent, location, and timing of such an act. We would be particularly adversely affected by a terrorist act affecting any metropolitan area where our policyholders have a large concentration of workers.

Notwithstanding the protection provided by the reinsurance we have purchased and any protection provided by the 2002 Act, or its extension, TRIPRA of 2015, the risk of severe losses to us from acts of terrorism has not been eliminated because our excess of loss reinsurance treaty program contains various sub-limits and exclusions limiting our reinsurers' obligation to cover losses caused by acts of terrorism. Our excess of loss reinsurance treaties do not protect against nuclear, biological, chemical, or radiological events. If such an event were to impact one or more of the

businesses we insure, we would be entirely responsible for any workers' compensation claims arising out of such event, subject to the terms of the 2002 Act and TRIPRA of 2015 and could suffer substantial losses as a result. Our operations also expose us to claims arising out of catastrophes because we may be required to pay benefits to workers who are injured in the workplace as a result of a catastrophe. Catastrophes can be caused by various unpredictable events, either natural or man-made. Any catastrophe occurring in the communities in which we operate or that have significant impacts on one or more of our targeted classes of business could expose us to potentially substantial losses and, accordingly, could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition and results of operations.

Administrative proceedings or legal actions involving our insurance subsidiaries could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Our insurance subsidiaries are involved in various administrative proceedings and legal actions in the normal course of their insurance operations. Our subsidiaries have responded to the actions and intend to defend against these claims. These claims concern issues including eligibility for workers' compensation insurance coverage or benefits, the extent of injuries, wage determinations, disability ratings, and bad faith and extra-contractual liability. Adverse decisions in multiple administrative proceedings or legal actions could require us to pay significant amounts in the aggregate or to change the manner in which we administer claims, which could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition and results of operations.

Our business is largely dependent on the efforts of our management because of its industry expertise, knowledge of our markets, and relationships with the independent agents and brokers that sell our products.

Our success depends in substantial part upon our ability to attract and retain qualified executive officers, experienced underwriting and claims personnel, and other skilled employees who are knowledgeable about our business. The current success of our business is dependent in significant part on the efforts of Douglas D. Dirks, our President and Chief Executive Officer, and Terry Eleftheriou, our Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer. Many of our regional and local officers are also important to our operations because of their industry expertise, knowledge of our markets, and relationships with the independent agents and brokers who sell our products. We have entered into employment agreements with certain of our key executives. Currently, we maintain key man life insurance for our Chief Executive Officer. If we were to lose the services of members of our management team or key regional or local officers, we may be unable to find replacements satisfactory to us and our business. As a result, our operations may be disrupted and our financial performance and results of operations may be adversely affected.

Assessments and other surcharges for guaranty funds, second injury funds, and other mandatory pooling arrangements may reduce our profitability.

All states require insurance companies licensed to do business in their state to bear a portion of the unfunded obligations of insolvent insurance companies. These obligations are funded by assessments that can be expected to continue in the future in the states in which we operate. Many states also have laws that establish second injury funds to provide compensation to injured employees for aggravation of a prior condition or injury, which are funded by either assessments based on paid losses or premium surcharge mechanisms. In addition, as a condition to the ability to conduct business in some states, insurance companies are required to participate in mandatory workers' compensation shared market mechanisms or pooling arrangements, which provide workers' compensation insurance coverage from private insurers. The effect of these assessments and mandatory shared market mechanisms or changes in them could reduce our profitability in any given period or limit our ability to grow our business.

State insurance laws, certain provisions of our charter documents, and Nevada corporation law could prevent or delay a change of control that could be beneficial to us and our stockholders.

Our insurance subsidiaries are domiciled in Florida, California, and Nevada. The insurance laws of these states generally require that any person seeking to acquire control of a domestic insurance company obtain the prior approval of the state's insurance commissioner. In Florida, "control" is generally presumed to exist through the direct or indirect ownership of 5% or more of the voting securities of a domestic insurance company or of any entity that controls a domestic insurance company. In California and Nevada, "control" is presumed to exist through the direct or indirect ownership of 10% or more of the voting securities of a domestic insurance company or of any entity that controls a domestic insurance company. In addition, insurance laws in many states in which we are licensed require pre-notification to the state's insurance commissioner of a change in control of a non-domestic insurance company licensed in those states. Because we have insurance subsidiaries domiciled in Florida, California, and Nevada, any transaction that would constitute a change in control of us would generally require the party acquiring control to obtain the prior approval of the insurance commissioners of these states and may require pre-notification of the change of control in these or other states. The time required to obtain these approvals may result in a material delay of, or deter, any such transaction. These laws may discourage potential acquisition proposals or tender offers, and may delay, deter, or prevent a change of control, even if the acquisition proposal or tender offer is favorable to our stockholders.

Provisions of our amended and restated articles of incorporation and amended and restated by-laws could discourage, delay, or prevent a merger, acquisition, or other change in control of us, even if our stockholders might consider such a change in control to be favorable. These provisions could also discourage proxy contests and make it more difficult for stockholders to elect Directors and take other corporate actions. In particular, our amended and restated articles of incorporation and amended and restated by-laws include provisions:

- dividing our Board of Directors into three classes;
- eliminating the ability of our stockholders to call special meetings of stockholders;
- permitting our Board of Directors to issue preferred stock in one or more series;
- imposing advance notice requirements for nominations for election to our Board of Directors or for proposing matters that can be acted upon by stockholders at the stockholder meetings;

prohibiting stockholder action by written consent, thereby limiting stockholder action to that taken at an annual or special meeting of our stockholders; and

providing our Board of Directors with exclusive authority to adopt or amend our by-laws.

These provisions may make it difficult for stockholders to replace Directors and could have the effect of discouraging a future takeover attempt that is not approved by our Board of Directors, but which stockholders might consider favorable. Additionally, these provisions could limit the price that investors are willing to pay in the future for shares of our common stock.

Item 1B. Unresolved Staff Comments

None.

Item 2. Properties

Our principal executive offices are 79,533 square feet located in leased premises in Reno, Nevada. As of February 1, 2015, we leased 229,396 square feet of office space in 8 states. We believe that our existing office space is adequate for our current needs. We will continue to enter into or exit lease agreements to address future space requirements, as necessary.

Item 3. Legal Proceedings

From time to time, we are involved in pending and threatened litigation in the normal course of business in which claims for monetary damages are asserted. In the opinion of management, the ultimate liability, if any, arising from such pending or threatened litigation is not expected to have a material effect on our result of operations, liquidity, or financial position.

Item 4. Mine Safety Disclosures

Not applicable.

PART II

Item 5. Market for Registrant's Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities

Market Information, Holders, and Stockholder Dividends

Our common stock is listed on the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) under the symbol "EIG." There were 1,130 holders of record as of February 12, 2015. High and low sales prices and cash dividends declared for the last two fiscal years were as follows:

Quarter Ended	2014 Stock Price		Cash Dividends Declared	2013 Stock Price		Cash Dividends Declared
	High	Low		High	Low	
March 31	\$31.60	\$18.91	\$0.06	\$23.58	\$20.57	\$0.06
June 30	23.14	19.17	0.06	25.92	21.12	0.06
September 30	22.26	18.89	0.06	29.93	24.26	0.06
December 31	23.70	18.81	0.06	32.90	27.77	0.06

We currently expect that cash dividends will continue to be paid in the future; however, any determination to pay additional or future dividends will be at the discretion of our Board of Directors and will be dependent upon:

• the surplus and earnings of our subsidiaries and their ability to pay dividends and/or other statutorily permissible payments to us;

• our results of operations and cash flows;

• our financial position and capital requirements;

• general business conditions;

• any legal, tax, regulatory, and/or contractual restrictions on the payment of dividends; and

• any other factors our Board of Directors deems relevant.

There were no unregistered sales or purchases of equity securities during the three months ended December 31, 2014.

Performance Graph

The following information compares the cumulative total return on \$100 invested in the common stock of EHI, ticker symbol EIG, for the period commencing on December 31, 2009 and ending on December 31, 2014 with the cumulative total return on \$100 invested in each of the Standard and Poor's 500 Index (S&P 500) and the Standard and Poor's 500 Property-Casualty Insurance Index (S&P P&C Insurance Index). The calculation of cumulative total return assumes the reinvestment of dividends. The following graph and related information shall not be deemed to be "soliciting material" or to be "filed" with the SEC, nor shall such information be incorporated by reference into any filing pursuant to the Securities Act of 1933 or the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, except to the extent that we specifically incorporate it by reference into such filing.

Employers Holdings, Inc.

Cumulative Total Return Performance

	Period Ending					
	12/31/2009	12/31/2010	12/31/2011	12/31/2012	12/31/2013	12/31/2014
Employers Holdings, Inc.	100.00	115.76	121.61	140.27	217.71	163.56
S&P 500	100.00	115.06	117.49	136.30	180.44	205.14
S&P P&C Insurance Index	100.00	108.94	108.67	130.52	180.50	208.92

Item 6. Selected Financial Data

The following selected historical consolidated financial data should be read in conjunction with "Item 7—Management's Discussion and Analysis of Consolidated Financial Condition and Results of Operations" and the consolidated financial statements and related notes included elsewhere in this annual report on Form 10-K.

	Years Ended December 31,				
	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010
Income Statement Data (in thousands, except per share amounts and ratios)					
Revenues:					
Net premiums earned	\$684,467	\$642,349	\$501,464	\$363,424	\$321,786
Net investment income	72,354	70,764	72,363	80,117	83,032
Realized gains on investments, net	16,338	9,529	5,048	20,161	10,137
Other income	308	939	307	452	649
Total revenues	773,467	723,581	579,182	464,154	415,604
Net income before income taxes	106,559	53,174	97,544	46,517	66,992
Income tax expense (benefit)	5,875	(10,650)	(9,347)	(2,106)	3,523
Net income	\$100,684	\$63,824	\$106,891	\$48,623	\$63,469
Earnings per common share					
Basic	\$3.19	\$2.05	\$3.40	\$1.30	\$1.53
Diluted	3.14	2.00	3.37	1.30	1.53
Selected Operating Data					
Gross premiums written ⁽¹⁾	\$697,712	\$689,871	\$580,327	\$418,512	\$322,277
Net premiums written ⁽²⁾	\$687,624	\$678,466	\$569,676	\$410,038	\$313,098
Combined ratio ⁽³⁾	97.0	% 103.9	% 95.3	% 113.9	% 106.6
Net income before impact of the LPT Agreement ⁽⁴⁾⁽⁵⁾⁽⁶⁾	\$45,674	\$25,890	\$6,957	\$29,324	\$43,754
Earnings per common share before impact of the LPT Agreement ⁽⁶⁾					
Basic	\$1.45	\$0.83	\$0.22	\$0.79	1.06
Diluted	1.42	0.81	0.22	0.78	1.06
Cash dividends declared per common share	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24
As of December 31,					
	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010
Balance Sheet Data (in thousands)					
Cash and cash equivalents	\$103,573	\$34,503	\$140,661	\$252,300	\$119,825
Total investments	2,448,454	2,344,858	2,149,514	1,950,745	2,080,494
Reinsurance recoverable on paid and unpaid losses	680,144	751,078	814,853	951,569	970,458
Total assets	3,769,655	3,643,449	3,511,339	3,482,310	3,480,665
Unpaid losses and loss adjustment expense	2,369,666	2,330,491	2,231,540	2,272,363	2,279,729
Deferred reinsurance gain—LPT Agreement ⁽⁴⁾⁽⁵⁾	207,020	249,072	281,043	365,963	383,399
Notes payable	92,000	102,000	112,000	122,000	132,000
Total liabilities	3,082,811	3,074,746	2,971,958	3,020,327	3,003,062
Total stockholders' equity	686,844	568,703	539,381	461,983	477,603
Other Financial Data					
Total stockholders' equity including deferred reinsurance gain—LPT Agreement ⁽⁴⁾⁽⁵⁾⁽⁷⁾	\$893,864	\$817,775	\$820,424	\$827,946	\$861,002

- (1) Gross premiums written is the sum of direct premiums written and assumed premiums written before the effect of ceded reinsurance. Direct premiums written are the premiums on all policies our insurance subsidiaries have issued during the year. Assumed premiums written are premiums that our insurance subsidiaries have received from any authorized state-mandated pools.

Net premiums written is the sum of direct premiums written and assumed premiums written less ceded premiums
(2) written. Ceded premiums written is the portion of direct premiums written that we cede to our reinsurers under our reinsurance contracts. (See Note 10 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements.)

Combined ratio is the sum of the losses and LAE, commission expense, and underwriting and other operating
(3) expenses, divided by net premiums earned. Because we only have one operating segment, holding company expenses are included in the combined ratio.

In connection with our January 1, 2000 assumption of the assets, liabilities and operations of the Fund, our Nevada
(4) insurance subsidiary assumed the Fund's rights and obligations associated with the LPT Agreement, a retroactive 100% quota share reinsurance agreement with third party reinsurers, which substantially reduced our exposure to losses for pre-July 1, 1995 Nevada insured risks. Pursuant to the LPT

Agreement, the Fund initially ceded \$1.5 billion in liabilities for incurred but unpaid losses and LAE, which represented substantially all of the Fund's outstanding losses as of June 30, 1999 for claims with original dates of injury prior to July 1, 1995.

Deferred reinsurance gain–LPT Agreement reflects the unamortized gain from our LPT Agreement. Under GAAP, this gain is deferred and is being amortized using the recovery method. Amortization is determined by the proportion of actual reinsurance recoveries to total estimated recoveries over the life of the LPT Agreement, except for the contingent profit commission, which is amortized through June 30, 2024. The amortization is reflected in losses and LAE. We periodically reevaluate the remaining direct reserves subject to the LPT Agreement and the expected losses and LAE subject to the contingent profit commission under the LPT Agreement. Our reevaluations result in corresponding adjustments, if needed, to reserves, ceded reserves, contingent commission receivable, and the Deferred Gain, with the net effect being an increase or decrease, as the case may be, to net income.

We define net income before impact of the LPT Agreement as net income before the impact of: (a) amortization of Deferred Gain; (b) adjustments to the LPT Agreement ceded reserves; and (c) adjustments to contingent commission receivable–LPT Agreement. These are not measurements of financial performance under GAAP, but rather reflect the difference in accounting treatment between SAP and GAAP, and should not be considered in isolation or as an alternative to any other measure of performance derived in accordance with GAAP.

We present net income before impact of the LPT Agreement because we believe that it is an important supplemental measure of operating performance to be used by analysts, investors, and other interested parties in evaluating us. The LPT Agreement was a non-recurring transaction which does not affect our ongoing operations and consequently we believe these presentations are useful in providing a meaningful understanding of our operating performance. In addition, we believe these non-GAAP measures, as we have defined them, are helpful to our management in identifying trends in our performance because the items excluded have limited significance in our current and ongoing operations.

The table below shows the reconciliation of net income to net income before impact of the LPT Agreement for the periods presented:

	Years Ended December 31,				
	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010
	(in thousands)				
Net income	\$100,684	\$63,824	\$106,891	\$48,623	\$63,469
Less amortization of the Deferred Gain related to losses	11,147	12,890	15,393	17,147	18,233
Less amortization of the Deferred Gain related to contingent commission	1,905	1,710	1,583	1,102	1,090
Less impact of LPT Reserve Adjustments ^(a)	31,112	18,986	73,349	—	—
Less impact of LPT Contingent Commission Adjustments ^(b)	10,846	4,348	9,609	1,050	392
Net income before impact of the LPT Agreement	\$45,674	\$25,890	\$6,957	\$29,324	\$43,754

Any adjustment to the estimated reserves ceded under the LPT Agreement results in a cumulative adjustment to the Deferred Gain, which is also included in losses and LAE incurred in the consolidated statement of comprehensive income, such that the Deferred Gain reflects the balance that would have existed had the revised reserves been recognized at the inception of the LPT Agreement (LPT Reserve Adjustment). (See Note 2 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements.)

Any adjustment to the contingent profit commission under the LPT Agreement results in a cumulative adjustment to the Deferred Gain, which is also recognized in losses and LAE incurred in the consolidated statement of comprehensive income, such that the Deferred Gain reflects the balance that would have existed had the revised contingent profit commission been recognized at the inception of the LPT Agreement. (LPT Contingent Commission Adjustment). (See Note 2 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements.)

We define total equity including the Deferred Gain as total equity plus the Deferred Gain. Total equity including the Deferred Gain is not a measurement of financial position under GAAP and should not be considered in

isolation or as an alternative to total equity or any other measure of financial health derived in accordance with GAAP.

We present total equity including the Deferred Gain because we believe that it is an important supplemental measure of financial position to be used by analysts, investors, and other interested parties in evaluating us. The LPT Agreement was a non-recurring transaction and the treatment of the Deferred Gain does not result in ongoing cash benefits or charges to our current operations and consequently we believe this presentation is useful in providing a meaningful understanding of our financial position.

The table below shows the reconciliation of total equity to total equity including the Deferred Gain for the periods presented:

	As of December 31,				
	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010
	(in thousands)				
Total stockholders' equity	\$686,844	\$568,703	\$539,381	\$461,983	\$477,603
Deferred Gain	207,020	249,072	281,043	365,963	383,399
Total stockholders' equity including the Deferred Gain	\$893,864	\$817,775	\$820,424	\$827,946	\$861,002

Item 7. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Consolidated Financial Condition and Results of Operations

The following discussion and analysis of our financial condition and results of operations should be read in conjunction with the consolidated financial statements and the accompanying notes thereto included in Item 8 and Item 15 of this report. In addition to historical information, the following discussion contains forward-looking statements that are subject to risks and uncertainties and other factors described in Item 1A of this report. Our actual results in future periods may differ from those referred to herein due to a number of factors, including the risks described in the sections entitled "Risk Factors" and "Forward-Looking Statements" elsewhere in this report.

Overview

We are a Nevada holding company. Through our insurance subsidiaries, we provide workers' compensation insurance coverage to select, small businesses in low to medium hazard industries. Workers' compensation insurance is provided under a statutory system wherein most employers are required to provide coverage for their employees' medical, disability, vocational rehabilitation, and/or death benefit costs for work-related injuries or illnesses. We provide workers' compensation insurance in 31 states and the District of Columbia, with a concentration in California, where over one-half of our business is generated. Our revenues are primarily comprised of net premiums earned, net investment income, and net realized gains on investments.

We target small businesses, as we believe that this market is traditionally characterized by fewer competitors, more attractive pricing, and stronger persistency when compared to the U.S. workers' compensation insurance industry in general. We believe we are able to price our policies at levels which are competitive and profitable over the long-term. Our underwriting approach is to consistently underwrite small business accounts at appropriate and competitive prices without sacrificing long-term profitability and stability for short-term top-line revenue growth.

Results of Operations

Overall, net income was \$100.7 million, \$63.8 million, and \$106.9 million in 2014, 2013, and 2012, respectively and we recognized underwriting income (losses) of \$20.6 million, \$(24.8) million, and \$23.3 million for the same periods, respectively. Underwriting income or loss is determined by deducting losses and LAE, commission expense, and underwriting and other operating expenses from net premiums earned. Key factors that affected our financial performance during 2014 and 2013, each compared to the previous year, respectively, include:

• Gross premiums written increased 1% and 19%;

• Net premiums earned increased 7% and 28%;

• Net realized gains on investments increased \$6.8 million and \$4.5 million;

• Losses and LAE decreased 2% and increased 61%;

• Underwriting and other operating expenses increased 3% and 1%; and

• Income tax expense was \$5.9 million in 2014, while we had income tax benefits of \$10.7 million and \$9.3 million in 2013 and 2012, respectively.

In 2014, we began execution of a number of key strategic initiatives, including: centralizing management of sales and underwriting operations; creating a new department focused on internal and customer facing business process excellence; slowing policy count growth in California as we diversify our risk exposure across our markets; establishing a three-company pricing platform in California with newly approved rates and territorial multipliers; increasing pricing for under-performing class codes; and targeting attractive classes of business across all of our markets.

The following items were included in our 2014 results of operations: (1) favorable development in the estimated reserves ceded under the LPT Agreement that resulted in a \$31.1 million cumulative adjustment to the Deferred reinsurance gain—LPT Agreement (Deferred Gain) and reduced our losses and LAE by the same amount (LPT Reserve Adjustment); (2) an increase in the contingent commission receivable under the LPT Agreement that resulted in a \$10.8 million cumulative adjustment, which reduced our losses and LAE by the same amount (LPT Contingent Commission Adjustment); and (3) a reallocation of \$13.1 million of reserves from non-taxable periods prior to January 1, 2000, which reduced our effective tax rate by 3.4 percentage points, or \$3.6 million. Collectively, these items increased net income by \$45.5 million for the year ended December 31, 2014.

The following items were included in our 2013 results of operations: (1) unfavorable prior accident year loss development of \$6.9 million, including \$5.0 million related to California loss reserves for the 2009 through 2011

accident years and \$1.9 million related to our assigned risk business, which increased our losses and LAE by the same amount during 2013; (2) favorable development in the estimated reserves ceded under the LPT Agreement during 2013, which resulted in a \$19.0 million cumulative adjustment to the Deferred Gain (LPT Reserve Adjustment); (3) an increase in the contingent commission receivable under the LPT Agreement that resulted in a \$4.3 million cumulative adjustment, which reduced our losses and LAE by the same amount (LPT Contingent Commission Adjustment); and (4) a reallocation of reserves from non-taxable periods prior to January 1, 2000, which reduced

our effective tax rate by 13.9 percentage points, or \$7.4 million, in 2013. Collectively, these items increased net income by \$23.8 million for the year ended December 31, 2013.

The following items were included in our 2012 results of operations: (1) favorable development in the estimated reserves ceded under the LPT Agreement, which resulted in a \$73.3 million LPT Reserve Adjustment; (2) an increase in the contingent commission receivable under the LPT Agreement that resulted in a \$9.6 million LPT Contingent Commission Adjustment; and (3) guidance issued by the Financial Accounting Standards Board that, beginning in 2012, changed the definition of policy acquisition costs which may be capitalized, resulting in a \$7.1 million increase in our underwriting and other operating expenses during 2012. Collectively, these items increased net income by \$75.8 million for the year ended December 31, 2012.

A primary measure of our performance is our ability to increase stockholders' equity, including the impact of the Deferred Gain, over the long-term; however, during periods of rising interest rates, the fair value of the fixed income component of our investment portfolio may be negatively impacted, thereby reducing stockholders' equity. The following table shows our stockholders' equity including the Deferred Gain, stockholders' equity on a GAAP basis, and number of common shares outstanding at December 31:

	2014	2013
	(in thousands, except share data)	
Stockholders' equity including the Deferred Gain ⁽¹⁾	\$893,864	\$817,775
GAAP stockholders' equity	686,844	568,703
Common shares outstanding	31,493,828	31,299,930

⁽¹⁾ Stockholders' equity, including the Deferred Gain, is a non-GAAP measure that is defined as total stockholders' equity plus the Deferred Gain, which we believe is an important supplemental measure of our capital position.

Our ability to increase stockholders' equity is dependent on our maintaining focus on disciplined underwriting and continuing to pursue profitable growth opportunities across market cycles; however, we continue to be affected by persistently low investment yields.

The comparative components of net income are set forth in the following table:

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2014	2013	2012
	(in thousands)		
Net premiums earned	\$684,467	\$642,349	\$501,464
Net investment income	72,354	70,764	72,363
Realized gains on investments, net	16,338	9,529	5,048
Other income	308	939	307
Total revenues	773,467	723,581	579,182
Losses and LAE	453,354	463,579	287,910
Commission expense	81,382	78,258	65,580
Underwriting and other operating expenses	129,167	125,324	124,644
Interest expense	3,005	3,246	3,504
Income tax expense (benefit)	5,875	(10,650)	(9,347)
Total expenses	672,783	659,757	472,291
Net income	\$100,684	\$63,824	\$106,891
Less amortization of the Deferred Gain related to losses	11,147	12,890	15,393
Less amortization of the Deferred Gain related to contingent commission	1,905	1,710	1,583
Less impact of LPT Reserve Adjustments ⁽¹⁾	31,112	18,986	73,349
Less impact of LPT Contingent Commission Adjustments ⁽²⁾	10,846	4,348	9,609
Net income before impact of the LPT Agreement ⁽³⁾	\$45,674	\$25,890	\$6,957

⁽¹⁾ Any adjustment to the estimated reserves ceded under the LPT Agreement results in a cumulative adjustment to the Deferred Gain, which is also included in losses and LAE incurred in the consolidated statement of comprehensive

income, such that the Deferred Gain reflects the balance that would have existed had the revised reserves been recognized at the inception of the LPT Agreement. (See Note 2 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements.)

Any adjustment to the contingent profit commission under the LPT Agreement results in a cumulative adjustment to the Deferred Gain, which is also recognized in losses and LAE incurred in the consolidated statement of (2) comprehensive income, such that the Deferred Gain reflects the balance that would have existed had the revised contingent profit commission been recognized at the inception of the LPT Agreement. (See Note 2 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements.)

We define net income before impact of the LPT Agreement as net income before the impact of: (a) amortization of Deferred Gain; (b) adjustments to LPT Agreement ceded reserves; and (c) adjustments to contingent commission receivable –LPT Agreement. Deferred Gain reflects the unamortized gain from our LPT Agreement. Under GAAP, this gain is deferred and is being amortized using the recovery method. Amortization is determined by the proportion of actual reinsurance recoveries to total estimated recoveries over the life of the LPT Agreement, except for the contingent profit commission, which is amortized through June 30, 2024. The amortization is reflected in losses and LAE. We periodically reevaluate the remaining direct reserves subject to the LPT Agreement and the expected losses and LAE subject to the contingent profit commission under the LPT Agreement. Our reevaluation results in corresponding adjustments, if needed, to reserves, ceded reserves, contingent commission receivable, and the Deferred Gain, with the net effect being an increase or decrease, as the case may be, to net income. Net income before impact of the LPT Agreement is not a measurement of financial performance under GAAP, but rather reflects the difference in accounting treatment between statutory and GAAP, and should not be considered in isolation or as an alternative to net income before income taxes or net income, or any other measure of performance derived in accordance with GAAP.

We present net income before impact of the LPT Agreement because we believe that it is an important supplemental measure of operating performance to be used by analysts, investors and other interested parties in evaluating us. The LPT Agreement was a non-recurring transaction, under which the Deferred Gain does not effect our ongoing operations, and, consequently, we believe this presentation is useful in providing a meaningful understanding of our operating performance. In addition, we believe this non-GAAP measure, as we have defined it, is helpful to our management in identifying trends in our performance because the excluded item has limited significance in our current and ongoing operations.

Gross Premiums Written

Gross premiums written were \$697.7 million, \$689.9 million, and \$580.3 million for the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013, and 2012, respectively. The slower rate of growth in gross premiums written in 2014 was primarily the result of actions that we initiated in June of 2014 to increase net rate, specifically in southern California.

Net Premiums Earned

Net premiums earned were \$684.5 million, \$642.3 million, and \$501.5 million for the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013, and 2012, respectively. The increase in net premiums earned over the past three years was primarily due to increasing policy count, increasing average policy size, and higher net rate.

The following table shows the percentage change in our in-force premiums, policy count, average policy size, payroll exposure upon which our premiums are based, and net rate as of December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively, overall and for California, where 59% of our premiums are generated:

	Percentage Change 2014 Over 2013		Percentage Change 2013 Over 2012	
	Overall	California	Overall	California
In-force premiums	1.7	% 0.8	% 14.9	% 15.7
In-force policy count	1.5	(2.0)	5.3	2.6
Average in-force policy size	0.2	2.8	9.1	12.8
In-force payroll exposure	(2.1)	(9.3)	5.7	2.5
Net rate ⁽¹⁾	3.9	11.2	8.8	12.9

Net rate, defined as total in-force premiums divided by total insured payroll exposure, is a function of a variety of (1) factors, including rate changes, underwriting risk profiles and pricing, and changes in business mix related to economic and competitive pressures.

Net Investment Income and Realized Gains on Investments, Net

We invest our holding company assets, statutory surplus, and the funds supporting our insurance liabilities, including unearned premiums and unpaid losses and LAE. We invest in fixed maturity securities, equity securities, and cash equivalents. Net investment income includes interest and dividends earned on our invested assets and amortization of premiums and discounts on our fixed maturity securities, less bank service charges and custodial and portfolio management fees. We have established a high quality/short duration bias in our investment portfolio.

Net investment income was \$72.4 million, \$70.8 million, and \$72.4 million for the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013, and 2012, respectively. The average pre-tax book yield on invested assets was 3.2%, 3.4%, and 3.7% at December 31, 2014, 2013, and 2012, respectively, while the tax-equivalent yield on invested assets was 3.8%, 4.0%, and 4.4% as of the same dates, respectively.

Realized gains and losses on our investments are reported separately from our net investment income. Realized gains and losses on investments include the gain or loss on a security at the time of sale compared to its original or adjusted cost (equity securities) or amortized cost (fixed maturity securities). Realized losses are also recognized when securities are written down as a result of an other-than-temporary impairment.

Net realized gains on investments were \$16.3 million, \$9.5 million, and \$5.0 million for the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013, and 2012, respectively. The increase in net realized gains on investments for the year ended December 31, 2014, compared to 2013, was primarily related to a re-balancing of our investment portfolio. Additional information regarding our Investments is set forth under “–Liquidity and Capital Resources–Investments” and Note 6 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements.

Combined Ratio

The combined ratio, a key measurement of underwriting profitability, is the sum of the loss and LAE ratio, the commission expense ratio, and underwriting and other operating expenses ratio. When the combined ratio is below 100%, we have recorded underwriting income, and conversely, when the combined ratio is greater than 100%, we have recorded an underwriting loss, and cannot be profitable without investment income. Because we only have one operating segment, holding company expenses are included in our calculation of the combined ratio.

The following table provides the calculation of our calendar year combined ratios.

	Years Ended December 31,			
	2014	2013	2012	
Loss and LAE ratio	66.2	% 72.2	% 57.4	%
Underwriting and other operating expenses ratio	18.9	19.5	24.8	
Commission expense ratio	11.9	12.2	13.1	
Combined ratio	97.0	% 103.9	% 95.3	%

Loss and LAE Ratio. This is the ratio of losses and LAE to net premiums earned.

We analyze our loss and LAE ratios on both a calendar year and accident year basis. A calendar year loss and LAE ratio is calculated by dividing the losses and LAE incurred during the calendar year, regardless of when the underlying insured event occurred, by the net premiums earned during that calendar year. The calendar year loss and LAE ratio includes changes made during the calendar year in reserves for losses and LAE established for insured events occurring in the current and prior years. A calendar year loss and LAE ratio is calculated using premiums and losses and LAE that are net of amounts ceded to reinsurers. The calendar year loss and LAE ratio for a particular year will not change in future periods.

The accident year loss and LAE ratio is calculated by dividing the losses and LAE, regardless of when such loss and LAE are incurred, for insured events that occurred during a particular year by the net premiums earned for that year. The accident year losses and LAE ratio is calculated using premiums and losses and LAE that are net of amounts ceded to reinsurers. The accident year loss and LAE ratio for a particular year can decrease or increase when recalculated in subsequent periods as the reserves established for insured events occurring during that year develop favorably or unfavorably, and is an operating ratio based on our statutory financial statements and is not derived from our GAAP financial information.

We analyze our calendar year loss and LAE ratio to measure our profitability in a particular year and to evaluate the adequacy of our premium rates charged in a particular year to cover expected losses and LAE from all periods, including development (whether favorable or unfavorable) of reserves established in prior periods. In contrast, we analyze our accident year loss and LAE ratios to evaluate our underwriting performance and the adequacy of the premium rates we charged in a particular year in relation to ultimate losses and LAE from insured events occurring during that year. The loss and LAE ratios provided in this report are calendar year basis, except where they are expressly identified as accident year loss and LAE ratios.

Losses and LAE represents our largest expense item and includes claim payments made, amortization of the Deferred Gain, estimates for future claim payments and changes in those estimates for current and prior periods, and costs associated with investigating, defending, and adjusting claims. The quality of our financial reporting depends in large part on accurately predicting our losses and LAE, which are inherently uncertain as they are estimates of the ultimate cost of individual claims based on actuarial estimation techniques.

Our indemnity claims frequency (the number of claims expressed as a percentage of payroll) has decreased year-over-year; however, our loss experience indicates an upward trend in medical and indemnity costs per claim that are reflected in our current accident year loss estimate. Specifically, we experienced increased costs associated with an increase in the number of cumulative trauma claims filed in California during 2014, compared to 2013. In 2013, we

experienced increased costs associated with claims litigation, driven by a nearly eight percentage point increase in the number of claims that were litigated in our southern California operations during the fourth quarter of 2013, compared to a six percentage point increase during the first three quarters of the year. In 2014, the rate of increase in the number of litigated claims in California moderated. We believe our current accident year loss estimate is adequate; however, ultimate losses will not be known with any certainty for many years. We assume that increasing medical and indemnity cost trends will continue to impact our long-term claims costs and current accident year loss estimate, which may be offset by rate increases. Additional information regarding our reserves for losses and LAE is set forth under “–Critical Accounting Policies–Reserves for Losses and LAE.”

Overall, losses and LAE were \$453.4 million, \$463.6 million, and \$287.9 million for the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013, and 2012, respectively. The decrease from 2013 to 2014 was primarily due to a decrease in the current accident year loss estimate, partially offset by higher net premiums earned. The increase from 2012 to 2013 was primarily due to higher net premiums earned in 2013. Additionally, there were favorable LPT Reserve Adjustments of \$31.1 million, \$19.0 million, and \$73.3 million that decreased losses and LAE by those amounts for the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013, and 2012, respectively. Unfavorable prior accident year development in 2013 included \$5.0 million related to California loss reserves for the 2009 through 2011 accident years and \$1.9 million related to our assigned risk business. Prior accident year loss development in 2014 and 2012 was primarily related to our assigned risk business. There was no material unfavorable loss development related to our voluntary business in 2014 or 2012. Our current accident year loss estimates were 73.6%, 77.0%, and 77.0% for the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013, and 2012, respectively. The trend in the current accident year loss estimates reflects the impact of higher net rate, which is a function of a variety of factors, including rate changes, underwriting risk profiles and pricing, and changes in business mix related to economic and competitive pressures, particularly in California, which was offset by increasing loss costs in 2013.

Excluding the impact from the LPT Agreement, losses and LAE would have been \$508.4 million, \$501.5 million, and \$387.8 million, or 74.3%, 78.1%, and 77.3% of net premiums earned, for the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013, and 2012, respectively.

The table below reflects losses and LAE reserve adjustments and the impact of the the LPT on net income before taxes.

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2014	2013	2012
	(in thousands)		
Prior accident year unfavorable development, net	\$(4,521)	\$(6,934)	\$(1,800)
Amortization of the Deferred Gain related to losses	\$11,147	\$12,890	\$15,393
Amortization of the Deferred Gain related to contingent commission	1,905	1,710	1,583
Impact of LPT Reserve Adjustments	31,112	18,986	73,349
Impact of LPT Contingent Commission Adjustments	10,846	4,348	9,609
Total impact of the LPT	\$55,010	\$37,934	\$99,934

Underwriting and Other Operating Expenses Ratio. The underwriting and other operating expenses ratio is the ratio of underwriting and other operating expenses to net premiums earned and measures an insurance company's operational efficiency in producing, underwriting, and administering its insurance business.

Underwriting and other operating expenses are those costs that we incur to underwrite and maintain the insurance policies we issue, excluding commission. These expenses include premium taxes and certain other general expenses that vary with, and are primarily related to, producing new or renewal business. Other underwriting expenses include policyholder dividends, changes in estimates of future write-offs of premiums receivable, general administrative expenses such as salaries and benefits, rent, office supplies, depreciation, and all other operating expenses not otherwise classified separately. Policy acquisition costs are variable based on premiums earned; however, other operating costs are more fixed in nature and become a smaller percentage of net premiums earned as premiums increase.

Our underwriting and other operating expenses ratio was 18.9%, 19.5%, and 24.8%, and our underwriting and other operating expenses were \$129.2 million, \$125.3 million, and \$124.6 million for the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013, and 2012, respectively. During the year ended December 31, 2014, premium taxes and assessments increased \$1.6 million as net premiums earned increased, professional fees increased \$1.0 million, and policyholder dividends increased \$0.8 million, compared to 2013. During the year ended December 31, 2013, premium taxes and assessments increased \$4.2 million and information technology expenses increased \$2.3 million, compared to 2012.

Additionally, implementation of the accounting guidance for deferred policy acquisition costs (DAC) resulted in a \$7.1 million increase in our underwriting and other operating expenses, partially offset by a \$1.4 million change in estimate for guaranty fund assessments for the year ended December 31, 2012. Excluding the impact of the DAC guidance and the change in estimate for guaranty fund assessments, underwriting and other operating expenses would

have increased \$6.4 million for the year ended December 31, 2013 compared to 2012.

Commission Expense Ratio. The commission expense ratio is the ratio of commission expense to net premiums earned and measures the cost of compensating agents and brokers for the business we have underwritten.

Commission expense includes direct commissions to our agents and brokers for the premiums that they produce for us, as well as incentive payments, other marketing costs, and fees.

Our commission expense ratio was 11.9%, 12.2%, and 13.1%, while our commission expense was \$81.4 million, \$78.3 million, and \$65.6 million for the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013, and 2012, respectively. While our commission expense is up

over the past three years, primarily due to higher net premiums earned, our commission expense ratio has decreased over the past three years, primarily due to lower base commissions and agency incentives as a percentage of premiums earned.

Interest Expense

We incur interest expenses on notes payable. Interest expense was \$3.0 million, \$3.2 million, and \$3.5 million for the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013, and 2012, respectively. The decrease in interest expense from 2012 to 2014 was primarily due to the reduction in principal balance on our credit facility with Wells Fargo by \$10.0 million in the fourth quarters of each of 2013 and 2014.

Income Tax Expense (Benefit)

Income tax expense (benefit) was \$5.9 million, \$(10.7) million, and \$(9.3) million for the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013, and 2012, respectively. The effective tax rate was 5.5%, (20.0)%, and (9.6)% for the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013, and 2012, respectively. The increased income tax expense for the year ended December 31, 2014, compared to 2013, was primarily due to the increase in underwriting income to \$20.6 million in 2014, compared to an underwriting loss of \$24.8 million in 2013.

The increased tax benefit for the year ended December 31, 2013, compared to 2012, was primarily due to the reallocation of \$27.2 million in reserves from non-taxable periods prior to January 1, 2000, during 2013, which reduced our effective tax rate by 13.9 percentage points for the year ended December 31, 2013.

For additional information regarding our income tax expense (benefit) see Note 8 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements.

Liquidity and Capital Resources

Parent Company Liquidity

We are a holding company and our ability to fund our operations is contingent upon existing capital and the ability of our insurance subsidiaries' to pay dividends up to the holding company. Payment of dividends by our insurance subsidiaries is restricted by state insurance laws and regulations, including laws establishing minimum solvency and liquidity thresholds. We require cash to pay stockholder dividends, repurchase common stock, make interest and principal payments on our outstanding debt obligations, provide additional surplus to our insurance subsidiaries, and fund our operating expenses.

In September 2013, EHI made a cash capital contribution totaling \$40 million to its operating subsidiaries to support future growth and maintain the subsidiaries' financial strength ratings.

Based on reported capital, surplus, and dividends paid within the last 12 months, the maximum dividends that may be paid by EICN and EPIC in 2015, without prior approval by the respective state insurance regulator, are \$37.4 million and \$26.1 million, respectively.

The holding company had \$63.3 million of cash and cash equivalents and fixed maturity securities maturing within the next 24 months at December 31, 2014. A principal payment of \$60 million on our line of credit is due on December 31, 2015. We believe that the liquidity needs of the holding company over the next 24 months will be met with cash, investments, and dividends from our insurance subsidiaries.

Operating Subsidiaries Liquidity

The primary sources of cash for our insurance operating subsidiaries are funds generated from underwriting operations, investment income, maturities and sales of investments, and capital contributions from the parent holding company. The primary uses of cash are payments of claims and operating expenses, purchases of investments, and payments of dividends to the parent holding company, which are subject to state insurance laws and regulations.

Our insurance subsidiaries had \$568.8 million of cash and cash equivalents and fixed maturity securities maturing within the next 24 months at December 31, 2014. We believe that our subsidiaries' liquidity needs over the next 24 months will be met with cash from operations, investment income, and maturing investments.

We purchase reinsurance to protect us against the costs of severe claims and catastrophic events. On July 1, 2014, we entered into a new reinsurance program that is effective through June 30, 2015. The reinsurance program consists of one treaty covering excess of loss and catastrophic loss events in five layers of coverage. Our reinsurance coverage is \$195.0 million in excess of our \$5.0 million retention on a per occurrence basis, subject to a \$2.0 million annual aggregate deductible and certain exclusions. We believe that our reinsurance program meets our needs and that we are

sufficiently capitalized.

Our insurance subsidiaries are required by law to maintain a certain minimum level of surplus on a statutory basis. Surplus is calculated by subtracting total liabilities from total admitted assets. The amount of capital in our insurance subsidiaries is maintained relative to standardized capital adequacy measures such as risk-based capital (RBC), as established by the National Association

32

of Insurance Commissioners. The RBC standard was designed to provide a measure by which regulators can assess the adequacy of an insurance company's capital and surplus relative to its operations. An insurance company must maintain capital and surplus of at least 200% of RBC. Each of our insurance subsidiaries had total adjusted capital in excess of the minimum RBC requirements that correspond to any level of regulatory action at December 31, 2014. Various state regulations require us to keep securities or letters of credit on deposit with certain states in which we do business. Securities having a fair market value of \$783.9 million and \$602.4 million were on deposit at December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively. These laws and regulations govern both the amount and types of fixed maturity securities that are eligible for deposit. Additionally, certain reinsurance contracts require company funds to be held in trust for the benefit of the ceding reinsurer to secure the outstanding liabilities we assumed. We held fixed maturity securities and restricted cash and cash equivalents that had a fair value of \$31.2 million and \$32.2 million in trust for the benefit of ceding reinsurers at December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively.

Sources of Liquidity

We monitor cash flows at both the consolidated and subsidiary levels. We use trend and variance analyses to project future cash needs, making adjustments to our forecasts as appropriate.

The table below shows our net cash flows. For additional information regarding our cash flows, see Item 8., Consolidated Statement of Cash Flows.

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2014	2013	2012
Cash and cash equivalents provided by (used in):	(in thousands)		
Operating activities	\$ 169,397	\$ 163,725	\$ 131,249
Investing activities	(85,498)	(258,890)	(184,424)
Financing activities	(14,829)	(10,993)	(58,464)
Increase (decrease) in cash and cash equivalents	\$ 69,070	\$ (106,158)	\$ (111,639)

Operating Cash Flows. Major components of net cash provided by operating activities in 2014 included net premiums received of \$673.7 million, and investment income received of \$82.7 million. These were partially offset by claims payments of \$386.6 million (net of \$33.2 million recovered from reinsurers), underwriting and other operating expenses paid of \$122.6 million (including premium taxes paid of \$27.1 million), and commissions paid of \$78.9 million.

Major components of net cash provided by operating activities in 2013 included net premiums received of \$624.0 million, and investment income received of \$78.8 million. These were partially offset by claims payments of \$332.8 million (net of \$33.1 million recovered from reinsurers), underwriting and other operating expenses paid of \$131.2 million (including premium taxes paid of \$22.7 million), and commissions paid of \$75.1 million.

Major components of net cash provided by operating activities in 2012 included net premiums received of \$508.7 million, and investment income received of \$79.6 million. These were partially offset by claims payments of \$276.9 million (net of \$38.2 million recovered from reinsurers), underwriting and other operating expenses paid of \$124.9 million (including premium taxes paid of \$16.9 million), and commissions paid of \$55.2 million.

Investing Cash Flows. The majority of net cash used in investing activities in 2014, 2013, and 2012 was related to the investment of premiums received and the reinvestment of funds from maturities and redemptions.

Financing Cash Flows. The majority of cash used in financing activities in 2014 and 2013 was to pay stockholder dividends and to pay down the line of credit provided by the Third Amended and Restated Credit Agreement with Wells Fargo (Amended Credit Facility). The majority of cash used in financing activities in 2012 was to repurchase \$41.8 million of our common stock, to pay dividends to stockholders, and to pay down the line of credit provided by the Amended Credit Facility.

Capital Resources

Our capital structure is comprised of outstanding debt and stockholders' equity. As of December 31, 2014, our capital structure consisted of a \$60.0 million principal balance on our Amended Credit Facility, \$32.0 million in surplus notes maturing in 2034, and \$893.9 million of stockholders' equity, including the Deferred Gain. Outstanding debt was 9.3% of total capitalization, including the Deferred Gain, as of December 31, 2014.

Ordinary Share Capital. The following table shows our beginning and ending stockholders' equity balance.

	December 31,		
	2014	2013	2012
	(in thousands)		
Beginning Balance	\$568,703	\$539,381	\$461,983
Stock-based compensation	6,033	5,622	6,141
Stock options exercised	2,155	7,356	1,431
Vesting of restricted stock units, net of shares withheld to satisfy minimum tax withholding	(600)	(894)	(592)
Acquisition of treasury stock	—	—	(41,795)
Dividend to common stockholders	(7,540)	(7,455)	(7,508)
Excess tax benefit from stock-based compensation	902	—	—
Net income for the year	100,684	63,824	106,891
Change in net unrealized gains on investments, net of taxes	16,507	(39,131)	12,830
Ending Balance	\$686,844	\$568,703	\$539,381

The following table shows our stockholders' equity including the Deferred Gain, with a reconciliation to our stockholders' equity on a GAAP basis.

	2014	2013
	(in thousands)	
GAAP stockholders' equity	\$686,844	\$568,703
Deferred reinsurance gain—LPT Agreement	207,020	249,072
Stockholders' equity including the Deferred Gain	893,864	817,775

Outstanding Debt. In December 2010, we entered into the Amended Credit Facility under which we were provided with: (a) \$100.0 million line of credit through December 31, 2011; (b) \$90.0 million line of credit from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012; (c) \$80.0 million line of credit from January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2013; (d) \$70 million line of credit from January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2014; and (e) \$60 million line of credit from January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015. Amounts outstanding bear interest at a rate equal to, at our option: (a) a fluctuating rate of 1.75% above prime rate or (b) a fixed rate that is 1.75% above the LIBOR rate then in effect. The Amended Credit Facility is secured by fixed maturity securities and restricted cash and cash equivalents that had a fair value of \$74.6 million and \$95.1 million at December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively. The Amended Credit Facility contains customary non-financial covenants and requires us to maintain 5% of the aggregate commitment amount of the line of credit in cash and cash equivalents at all times at the holding company. We are currently in compliance with all applicable covenants. In accordance with the terms of the contract, we repaid \$10.0 million of the line of credit provided by the Amended Credit Facility on December 30, 2014.

EPIC has a total of \$32.0 million in three surplus notes issued as part of a pooled transaction. The notes mature in 2034 and became callable by the Company in the second quarter of 2009.

Our total outstanding debt was \$92.0 million and \$102.0 million as of December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively. Interest and fees on debt obligations totaled \$2.8 million, \$3.1 million, and \$3.4 million in 2014, 2013, and 2012, respectively.

Contractual Obligations and Commitments. The following table identifies our long-term debt and contractual obligations as of December 31, 2014.

	Payment Due By Period				
	Total	Less Than 1-Year	1-3 Years	4-5 Years	More Than 5 Years
	(in thousands)				
Operating leases	\$11,402	\$4,842	\$5,722	\$809	\$29
Purchased liabilities	6,385	5,428	957	—	—
Notes payable ⁽¹⁾	120,816	62,567	2,829	2,829	52,591
Capital leases	1,446	621	640	185	—

Edgar Filing: Employers Holdings, Inc. - Form 10-K

Losses and LAE reserves ⁽²⁾⁽³⁾	2,369,666	374,643	449,848	266,528	1,278,647
Total contractual obligations	\$2,509,715	\$448,101	\$459,996	\$270,351	\$1,331,267

34

Notes payable obligations reflect payments for the principal and estimated interest expense based on LIBOR rates (1) plus a margin. The estimated interest expense was based on the contractual obligations of the debt outstanding as of December 31, 2014. The interest rates range from 1.92% to 4.48%.

Estimated losses and LAE reserve payment patterns have been computed based on historical information. Our calculation of loss and LAE reserve payments by period is subject to the same uncertainties associated with determining the level of reserves and to the additional uncertainties arising from the difficulty of predicting when (2) claims (including claims that have not yet been reported to us) will be paid. For a discussion of our reserving process, see "–Critical Accounting Policies–Reserves for Losses and LAE." Actual payments of losses and LAE by period will vary, perhaps materially, from the above table to the extent that current estimates of losses and LAE reserves vary from actual ultimate claims amounts due to variations between expected and actual payout patterns.

(3) The losses and LAE reserves are presented gross of reinsurance recoverables for unpaid losses, which were as follows for each of the periods presented above:

	Recoveries Due By Period				
	Total	Less Than 1 Year	1-3 Years	4-5 Years	More Than 5 Years
	(in thousands)				
Reinsurance recoverables on unpaid losses and LAE Investments	\$(669,481)	\$(33,992)	\$(64,510)	\$(59,956)	\$(511,023)

The cost or amortized cost of our investment portfolio was \$2.3 billion and the fair value was \$2.4 billion as of December 31, 2014.

We employ an investment strategy that emphasizes asset quality and considers the durations of fixed maturity securities against anticipated claim payments and expenditures, other liabilities, and capital needs. Our investment portfolio is structured so that investments mature periodically in reasonable relation to current expectations of future claim payments. Currently, we make claim payments from positive cash flow from operations and use excess cash to invest in operations, invest in marketable securities, return capital to our stockholders, and fund growth.

As of December 31, 2014, our investment portfolio, which is classified as available-for-sale, consisted of 93.0% fixed maturity securities whose fair values may fluctuate due to interest rate changes. We strive to limit interest rate risk by managing the duration of our fixed maturity securities. Our fixed maturity securities (excluding cash and cash equivalents) had a duration of 4.0 at December 31, 2014. To minimize interest rate risk, our portfolio is weighted toward short-term and intermediate-term bonds; however, our investment strategy balances consideration of duration, yield, and credit risk. Our investment guidelines require that the minimum weighted average quality of our fixed maturity securities portfolio shall be "AA-." Our fixed maturity securities portfolio had a weighted average quality of "AA-" as of December 31, 2014, with 57.4% of the portfolio rated "AA" or better, based on market value.

We carry our portfolio of equity securities on our balance sheet at fair value. We minimize our exposure to equity price risk by investing primarily in the equity securities of mid-to-large capitalization issuers and by diversifying our equity holdings across several industry sectors. Equity securities represented 7.0% of our investment portfolio at December 31, 2014.

Given current economic uncertainty and continuing market volatility, we believe that our current asset allocation best meets our strategy to preserve capital for policyholders, to provide sufficient income to support insurance operations, and to effectively grow book value over a long-term investment horizon.

We seek to maximize total investment returns within the constraints of prudent portfolio management. The asset allocation is reviewed by the Finance Committee of the Board of Directors on a quarterly basis. We employ Conning Asset Management (Conning) to act as our independent investment manager. Conning follows our written investment guidelines based upon strategies approved by the Board of Directors. In addition to the construction and management of the portfolio, we utilize the investment advisory services of Conning.

The following table shows the estimated fair value, the percentage of the fair value to total invested assets, the average book yield, and the average tax equivalent yield based on the fair value of each category of invested assets as of December 31, 2014.

Category	Estimated Fair Value (in thousands, except percentages)	Percentage of Total	Book Yield	Tax Equivalent Yield
U.S. Treasuries	\$166,760	6.8	% 1.9	% 1.9
U.S. Agencies	39,602	1.6	3.7	3.7
States and municipalities	745,764	30.5	3.6	5.2
Corporate securities	908,299	37.1	3.2	3.2
Residential mortgaged-backed securities	288,434	11.8	3.4	3.4
Commercial mortgaged-backed securities	65,403	2.7	2.4	2.4
Asset-backed securities	61,487	2.5	0.7	0.7
Equity securities	172,705	7.0	4.4	5.8
Total investments	\$2,448,454	100.0	%	
Weighted average yield			3.2	% 3.8

The following table shows the percentage of total estimated fair value of our fixed maturity securities as of December 31, 2014 by credit rating category, using the lower of ratings assigned by Moody's Investor Service and/or Standard & Poor's.

Rating	Percentage of Total Estimated Fair Value
"AAA"	9.7
"AA"	47.7
"A"	31.6
"BBB"	10.8
Below Investment Grade	0.2
Total	100.0

Investments that we currently own could be subject to default by the issuer or could suffer declines in fair value that become other-than-temporary. We regularly assess individual securities as part of our ongoing portfolio management, including the identification of other-than-temporary declines in fair value. Our other-than-temporary impairment assessment includes reviewing the extent and duration of declines in fair value of investments below amortized cost, historical and projected financial performance and near-term prospects of the issuer, the outlook for industry sectors, credit rating, and macro-economic changes. We also make a determination as to whether it is not more likely than not that we will be required to sell the security before its fair value recovers above cost, or maturity.

Based on our review of fixed maturity and equity securities, we believe that we appropriately identified the declines in the fair values of our unrealized losses for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013. We determined that the unrealized losses on fixed maturity securities were primarily the result of prevailing interest rates and not the credit quality of the issuers. The fixed maturity securities whose fair value was less than amortized cost were not determined to be other-than-temporarily impaired given the severity and duration of the impairment, the credit quality of the issuers, the Company's intent to not sell the securities, and a determination that it is not more likely than not that the Company will be required to sell the securities until fair value recovers to above cost, or maturity.

Based on reviews of the equity securities, the Company recognized an impairment of \$0.5 million and \$0.1 million in the fair values of seven and one equity securities for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively, as a result of our intent to sell and the severity and duration of the change in fair values of those securities. The remaining unrealized losses on equity securities were not considered to be other than temporary due to the financial condition and near-term prospects of the issuers.

For additional information regarding our investments, including the cost or amortized cost, gross unrealized gains, gross unrealized losses, and estimated fair value of our investments, the amortized cost and estimated fair value of fixed maturity securities by contractual maturity, and net realized and unrealized investment gains (losses) on fixed

maturity and equity securities, see Note 6 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements.

Off-Balance Sheet Arrangements

We have no off-balance sheet arrangements.

Critical Accounting Policies

The preparation of financial statements in accordance with GAAP requires both the use of estimates and judgment relative to the application of appropriate accounting policies. Our accounting policies are described in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements, but we believe that the following matters are particularly important to an understanding of our financial statements because changes in these estimates or changes in the assumptions used to make them could have a material impact on our results of operations, financial condition, and cash flows.

Reserves for Losses and LAE

Accounting for workers' compensation insurance requires us to estimate the liability for the expected ultimate cost of unpaid losses and LAE (loss reserves) as of a balance sheet date. Loss reserve estimates are inherently uncertain because the ultimate amount we pay for many of the claims we have incurred as of the balance sheet date will not be known for many years. Our estimate of loss reserves is intended to equal the difference between the expected ultimate losses and LAE of all claims that have occurred as of a balance sheet date and amounts already paid. We establish loss reserves based on our own analysis of emerging claims experience and environmental conditions in our markets and review of the results of various actuarial projections. Our aggregate carried reserve for unpaid losses and LAE is the sum of our reserves for each accident year and represents our best estimate of outstanding loss reserves.

The amount by which estimated losses in the aggregate differ from those previously estimated for a specific time period is known as reserve "development." Reserve development is unfavorable when losses ultimately settle for more than the amount reserved or subsequent estimates indicate a basis for reserve increases on open claims, causing the previously estimated loss reserves to be "deficient." Reserve development is favorable when estimates of ultimate losses indicate a decrease in established reserves, causing the previously estimated loss reserves to be "redundant." Development is reflected in our operating results through an adjustment to incurred losses and LAE during the period in which it is recognized.

Although claims for which reserves are established may not be paid for several years or more, we do not discount loss reserves in our financial statements for the time value of money.

The three main components of our reserves for unpaid losses and LAE are case reserves, incurred but not reported (IBNR) loss reserves, and LAE reserves.

When claims are reported to us, we establish individual estimates of the ultimate cost of each claim (case reserves).

These case reserves are continually monitored and revised in response to new information and for amounts paid.

IBNR is an actuarial estimate of future payments on claims that have occurred but have not yet been reported to us. In addition to this provision for late reported claims, we also estimate, and make a provision for, the extent to which the case reserves on known claims may develop and for additional payments on closed claims, known as "reopening." IBNR reserves apply to the entire body of claims arising from a specific time period, rather than a specific claim. Most of our IBNR reserves relate to estimated future claim payments on recorded open claims.

LAE reserves are our estimate of the future expenses of investigating, administering, and settling claims that will be paid to manage claims that have occurred, including legal expenses. LAE reserves are established in the aggregate, rather than on a claim-by-claim basis.

A portion of our obligations for losses and LAE are ceded to unaffiliated reinsurers. The amount of reinsurance that will be recoverable on our losses and LAE reserves includes both the reinsurance recoverable from our excess of loss reinsurance contracts, as well as reinsurance recoverable under the terms of the LPT Agreement.

Our reserves for unpaid losses and LAE (gross and net of reinsurance), including the main components of such reserves, were as follows:

	As of December 31,	
	2014	2013
	(in thousands)	
Case reserves	\$1,088,214	\$1,019,174
IBNR	982,647	1,034,189
LAE	298,805	277,128
Gross unpaid losses and LAE	2,369,666	2,330,491
Less reinsurance recoverables on unpaid losses and LAE, gross	669,481	743,055

Net unpaid losses and LAE	\$1,700,185	\$1,587,436
---------------------------	-------------	-------------

37

We use actuarial methods to analyze and estimate the aggregate amount of unpaid losses and LAE. Management considers the results of various actuarial projection methods and their underlying assumptions, among other factors, in establishing reserves for unpaid losses and LAE.

Judgment is required in the actuarial estimation of loss reserves, including the selection of various actuarial methodologies to project the following: the ultimate cost of claims; the selection of projection parameters based on historical company data, industry data, and other benchmarks; the identification and quantification of potential changes in parameters from historical levels to current and future levels due to changes in future claims development expectations; and the weighting of differing reserve indications resulting from alternative methods and assumptions. The adequacy of our ultimate loss reserves is inherently uncertain and represents a significant risk to our business. We attempt to mitigate this risk through our claims management processes and by monitoring and reacting to statistics relating to the cost and duration of claims.

We retain an independent actuarial consulting firm (Consulting Actuary) to perform comprehensive studies of our loss and LAE reserves on a semi-annual basis. The role of the Consulting Actuary is to conduct sufficient analyses to produce a range of reasonable estimates, as well as a point estimate, of our liability for unpaid losses and LAE, and to present those results to our actuarial staff and to management.

The Consulting Actuary determines its point estimate for Nevada losses based on a combination of methodologies, similar to those utilized for our other insurance subsidiaries, as described below. While such a determination, based on a combination of methodologies, is valid, management believes that using strictly paid loss methods for Nevada losses for 2007 and prior is the preferred approach given our depth of knowledge of Nevada losses and the consistency of paid data over time resulting from and related to the statutory prohibition of entering into full and final settlements of Nevada losses. This paid data provides a stable base for estimation of reserves. The Consulting Actuary has provided us with a sensitivity analysis for Nevada losses for 2007 and prior that is based strictly on the historically utilized paid loss methods.

We compile and aggregate our claims data by grouping the claims according to the year or quarter in which the claim occurred (“accident year” or “accident quarter”) when analyzing claim payment and emergence patterns and trends over time. Additionally, claims data is aggregated and compiled separately for different types of claims or claimant benefits and for different states or groups of states in which we do business.

Our internal actuaries and the Consulting Actuary prepare reserve estimates for all accident years using our own historical claims data and many of the generally accepted actuarial methodologies for estimating loss reserves, such as paid loss development methods, incurred loss development methods, and Bornhuetter-Ferguson methods. These methods vary in their responsiveness to different information, characteristics, and dynamics in the data, and the results assist the actuary in considering these characteristics and dynamics in the historical data. The methods employed for each segment of claims data, and the relative weight accorded to each method, vary depending on the nature of the claims segment and on the age of the claims.

Each actuarial methodology requires the selection and application of various parameters and assumptions. The key parameters and assumptions include: the pattern with which our aggregate claims data will be paid or will emerge over time; claims cost inflation rates; the effects of legislative benefit changes and/or judicial changes; and trends in the frequency of claims, both overall and by severity of claim. We believe the pattern with which our aggregate claims data will be paid or emerge over time, claims cost inflation rates, and claim frequencies are the most important parameters and assumptions.

In Nevada, one method involves adjusting historical data for inflation. The inflation rates used in the analysis are judgmentally selected based on historical year-to-year movements in the cost of claims observed in our insurance subsidiaries' data and industry-wide data, as well as on broader inflation indices. The results of this method would differ if different inflation rates were selected.

In projections using December 31, 2014 data, the method that uses explicit medical cost inflation assumptions included medical cost inflation assumptions ranging from 2.0% to 5.0%. The selection of medical cost inflation assumptions used has been based on observed recent and longer-term historical medical cost inflation in our claims data and in the U.S. economy more generally. The rate of medical cost inflation, as reflected in our historical medical payments per claim, has averaged approximately 3.0% over the past 10 years. The rate of medical cost inflation in the

general U.S. economy, as measured by the consumer price index-medical care, has averaged approximately 3.5% over the past 10 years.

Management along with internal actuarial staff and the Consulting Actuary separately analyze LAE and estimate unpaid LAE. These analyses rely primarily on examining the relationship between the aggregate amounts that have been spent on LAE historically, compared with the volume of claims activity for the corresponding historical calendar periods. The portion of unpaid LAE that will be recoverable from reinsurers is estimated based on the contractual reinsurance terms.

The range of estimates of loss reserves produced by the Consulting Actuary is intended to represent the range in which it is most likely that the ultimate losses will fall. This range is narrower than the range of indications produced by the individual methods applied because it is not likely that the high or low result will emerge for every claim segment and accident year. The Consulting Actuary's point estimate of loss reserves is based on a judgmental selection for each claim segment from within the range of results indicated by the different actuarial methods.

Management formally establishes loss reserves for financial statement purposes on a quarterly basis. In doing so, we make reference to the most current analyses of the Consulting Actuary and to that of our internal actuarial staff, including a review of the assumptions and the results of the various actuarial methods used. Comprehensive studies are conducted as of June 30 and December 31 by both internal actuarial staff and the Consulting Actuary. On the alternate quarters, the results of the preceding quarter's studies are updated for actual claim payment activity by internal actuarial staff.

The aggregate carried reserve calculated by management represents our best estimate of our outstanding unpaid losses and LAE. In establishing management's best estimate of unpaid losses and LAE at December 31 for the last three years, management and internal actuarial staff reviewed and considered the following: (a) the Consulting Actuary's assumptions, point estimate, and range; (b) the inherent uncertainty of workers' compensation liabilities for unpaid losses and LAE; and (c) the potential for legislative and/or judicial reversal of California workers' compensation reforms. Management did not quantify a specific loss reserve increment for each uncertainty, but rather established an overall provision for loss reserves that represented management's best estimate of unpaid losses and LAE in light of the historical data, actuarial assumptions, point estimate and range, and current facts and circumstances. Management continued to use a range and point estimate for Nevada losses for 2007 and prior based on paid loss methods, which our experience in Nevada indicates is more appropriate.

The table below provides the actuarial range of estimated liabilities for net unpaid losses and LAE and our carried reserves.

	As of December 31,		
	2014	2013	2012
	(in thousands)		
Low end of actuarial range	\$ 1,575,620	\$	