

Draft: 6/18/26

Severe Peril (EX) Working Group
Virtual Meeting
June 11, 2026

The Severe Peril (EX) Working Group of the Natural Catastrophe Risk and Resilience (EX) Task Force met June 11, 2026. The following Working Group members participated: Angela L. Nelson, Chair (MO); Heather Carpenter, Vice Chair (AK); Mark Fowler and Travis Taylor (AL); Lori Dreaver Munn (AZ); Mike Peterson (CA); George Bradner (CT); Anoush Brangaccio (FL); Caleb Malone (LA); Jackie Horigan (MA); Joy Y. Hatchette (MD); Sandra Darby (ME); Peter Brickwedde (MN); Mike Chaney and Andy Case (MS); and David Forte (WA).

1. Adopted its May 14 Minutes

The Working Group met May 14. During this meeting, it took the following action: 1) discussed its 2026 priorities; 2) discussed the Flood Insurance Blueprint; 3) heard a presentation from the Center for Insurance Policy and Research (CIPR) on flood maps as a risk indicator for consumers; and 4) received an update on the private flood insurance market.

Bradner made a motion, seconded by Forte, to adopt the Working Group's May 14 meeting minutes (Attachment X). The motion passed unanimously.

2. Received Results from the Regulator Survey on Flood Priorities

Jeff Czajkowski (NAIC) presented the results of a survey conducted among members of the Working Group and the Natural Catastrophe Risk and Resilience (EX) Task Force to help prioritize activities for developing the Flood Insurance Blueprint. He explained that the survey was designed to evaluate six proposed strategic focus areas based on both potential impact and ease of implementation. The six strategic categories were:

- Consumer awareness, education, and risk communication.
- Market development, product expansion, and affordability.
- Behavioral research and policy design.
- Consumer protection standards and claims practices.
- Mitigation, resilience, and incentives.
- Data, technology, coordination, and implementation.

Czajkowski reported that the category of consumer awareness, education, and risk communication received the highest overall ranking, followed by the consumer protection standards and claims practices category. The behavioral research and policy design category and the mitigation, resilience, and incentives category ranked closely behind the top two priorities. He noted that market development, product expansion, and affordability scored high on potential impact but were viewed by respondents as more challenging to implement.

Director Nelson stated that the results reflected the complexity of flood insurance issues and reinforced the importance of focusing on practical initiatives that deliver meaningful outcomes.

Case discussed Mississippi's mitigation program and described challenges involving legislative processes, stakeholder coordination, and funding delays. He noted that bridge funding provided by the state wind pool had

allowed the program to continue while awaiting additional appropriations. Case also emphasized the continuing need for agent education and public outreach regarding mitigation opportunities and available incentives.

Commissioner Chaney discussed ongoing efforts to promote the program through media appearances and public speaking engagements. He observed that knowledge gaps remain among both consumers and insurance professionals regarding available mitigation benefits and premium discounts.

Commissioner Fowler shared Alabama's experience with resilience and mitigation initiatives and emphasized the importance of engaging home builders early in the process. He stated that support from the homebuilding community had significantly accelerated the adoption of mitigation standards in Alabama. Taylor added that agent education remains an ongoing challenge and noted that financial considerations can influence producer engagement with mitigation programs.

Brickwedde suggested that the discussion highlighted the importance of behavioral research in understanding why consumers take, or fail to take, actions to reduce risk. He stated that a greater understanding of consumer decision-making could help states deploy limited resources more effectively.

Horigan recommended offering one final opportunity for members to complete the survey to maximize participation.

Bradner discussed Connecticut's efforts to educate producers regarding mitigation programs and flood-risk tools that incorporate data beyond Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood maps. Munn described recent outreach efforts involving real estate professionals and insurance producers and reported strong interest in consumer education and resilience programs.

Director Nelson commented that agents, realtors, and mortgage lenders represent important partners in communicating flood risk information and resilience opportunities. She stated that those stakeholder groups could play a significant role in future Blueprint initiatives.

Wes Bissett (Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of America—IIABA) emphasized that independent agents have actively supported mitigation initiatives in several states and encouraged insurance departments to engage their state agent associations as education and outreach partners.

Amy Bach (United Policyholders) discussed consumer communication efforts on wildfire risk and offered to connect the Working Group with a behavioral psychologist who has conducted research on effective risk communication strategies. Director Nelson welcomed the suggestion.

Director Nelson advised members that NAIC committee support would develop a follow-up survey focused on identifying specific activities and deliverables within the highest-priority Blueprint categories.

3. Received an Update on the Natural Catastrophe Risk Dashboard

Tim Nauheimer (NAIC) provided an overview of the Natural Catastrophe Risk Dashboard and reviewed recent developments associated with the project. He explained that the dashboard originated from recommendations contained in the NAIC *National Climate Resilience Strategy for Insurance* and was formally released in March 2026.

Nauheimer explained that the dashboard consists of two components: a public-facing summary report and a regulator-only analytical tool containing historical data and trend information. He stated that the dashboard

evaluates physical risk, transition risk, and insurance coverage trends, including measures related to catastrophe protection gaps.

Nauheimer reviewed several existing protection-gap indicators, including flood insurance coverage measures and comparisons between economic and insured catastrophe losses. He noted that certain data sources previously used to support flood-related metrics are no longer available, requiring NAIC staff to identify alternative data sources. He outlined several potential enhancement opportunities, including:

- Identifying replacement sources for flood insurance coverage and catastrophe-loss information.
- Evaluating additional protection-gap indicators.
- Exploring homeowners market data call information for new risk measures.
- Expanding catastrophe-modeling inputs.
- Developing state-specific or regional dashboard views.

Bradner discussed Connecticut's data-sharing agreement with FEMA and suggested that similar arrangements could help address some of the dashboard's data needs. Forte noted that Washington is pursuing a similar agreement.

Butch Kinerney (NAIC) informed members that FEMA representatives had recently renewed discussions about broader data-sharing opportunities and stated that NAIC staff would follow up with FEMA on a possible formal presentation at a future date.

Peterson expressed interest in exploring additional reinsurance and catastrophe modeling data as potential indicators of flood insurance market activity and offered to assist in evaluating possible data sources.

Director Nelson said the dashboard is becoming an increasingly valuable resource for regulators, policymakers, and consumers as interest in catastrophe resilience and insurance protection gaps continues to grow. She noted that the dashboard also provides an important tool for communicating risk trends and preparedness needs to external audiences.

Director Nelson told Working Group members that a more comprehensive discussion of dashboard enhancements would occur during a future meeting.

Having no further business, the Severe Peril (EX) Working Group adjourned.