

LaNeve Stephen  
 Form 4  
 November 03, 2009

**FORM 4**

**UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION  
 Washington, D.C. 20549**

OMB APPROVAL

OMB Number: 3235-0287  
 Expires: January 31, 2005  
 Estimated average burden hours per response... 0.5

Check this box if no longer subject to Section 16. Form 4 or Form 5 obligations may continue. See Instruction 1(b).

**STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN BENEFICIAL OWNERSHIP OF SECURITIES**

Filed pursuant to Section 16(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, Section 17(a) of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 or Section 30(h) of the Investment Company Act of 1940

(Print or Type Responses)

1. Name and Address of Reporting Person \*  
 LaNeve Stephen

(Last) (First) (Middle)

710 MEDTRONIC PKWY MS  
 LC310

(Street)

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55432

(City) (State) (Zip)

2. Issuer Name and Ticker or Trading Symbol  
 MEDTRONIC INC [MDT]

3. Date of Earliest Transaction (Month/Day/Year)  
 10/30/2009

4. If Amendment, Date Original Filed(Month/Day/Year)

5. Relationship of Reporting Person(s) to Issuer

(Check all applicable)

\_\_\_\_ Director \_\_\_\_\_ 10% Owner  
 \_\_\_\_ Officer (give title below) \_\_\_\_\_ Other (specify below)  
 SVP & Pres Spinal & Biologics

6. Individual or Joint/Group Filing(Check Applicable Line)  
 Form filed by One Reporting Person  
 Form filed by More than One Reporting Person

**Table I - Non-Derivative Securities Acquired, Disposed of, or Beneficially Owned**

1. Title of Security (Instr. 3)	2. Transaction Date (Month/Day/Year)	2A. Deemed Execution Date, if any (Month/Day/Year)	3. Transaction Code (Instr. 8)	4. Securities Acquired (A) or Disposed of (D) (Instr. 3, 4 and 5)	5. Amount of Securities Beneficially Owned Following Reported Transaction(s) (Instr. 3 and 4)	6. Ownership Form: Direct (D) or Indirect (I) (Instr. 4)	7. Nature of Ownership (Instr. 4)
				(A) or (D)	Price		
Common Stock					188,343	I	ESOP
Common Stock	10/30/2009		F	1,015 D	\$ 35.7	44,644.844	D

Reminder: Report on a separate line for each class of securities beneficially owned directly or indirectly.

**Persons who respond to the collection of information contained in this form are not required to respond unless the form displays a currently valid OMB control number.**

SEC 1474 (9-02)

Edgar Filing: LaNeve Stephen - Form 4

**Table II - Derivative Securities Acquired, Disposed of, or Beneficially Owned**  
(e.g., puts, calls, warrants, options, convertible securities)

1. Title of Derivative Security (Instr. 3)	2. Conversion or Exercise Price of Derivative Security	3. Transaction Date (Month/Day/Year)	3A. Deemed Execution Date, if any (Month/Day/Year)	4. Transaction Code (Instr. 8)	5. Number of Derivative Securities Acquired (A) or Disposed of (D) (Instr. 3, 4, and 5)	6. Date Exercisable and Expiration Date (Month/Day/Year)	7. Title and Amount of Underlying Securities (Instr. 3 and 4)	8. Price of Derivative Security (Instr. 5)	9. Number of Derivative Securities Owned Following Reporting Transaction (Instr. 6)
				Code	V (A) (D)	Date Exercisable	Expiration Date	Title	Amount or Number of Shares

## Reporting Owners

Reporting Owner Name / Address	Relationships			
	Director	10% Owner	Officer	Other
LaNeve Stephen 710 MEDTRONIC PKWY MS LC310 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55432			SVP & Pres Spinal & Biologics	

## Signatures

James N. Spolar,  
Attorney-in-fact  
11/03/2009

\_\_Signature of Reporting Person Date

## Explanation of Responses:

\* If the form is filed by more than one reporting person, see Instruction 4(b)(v).

\*\* Intentional misstatements or omissions of facts constitute Federal Criminal Violations. See 18 U.S.C. 1001 and 15 U.S.C. 78ff(a).

Note: File three copies of this Form, one of which must be manually signed. If space is insufficient, see Instruction 6 for procedure. Potential persons who are to respond to the collection of information contained in this form are not required to respond unless the form displays a currently valid OMB number. unless otherwise stated, the term "combined ratio" refers to a calculation based on U.S. generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP).

The statutory combined ratio for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 include the impact of \$27.5 million and \$100.0 million favorable adjustments to the ceded reserves under the Loss Portfolio Transfer Agreement for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively. See Note 2 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements.

Our statutory combined ratio for the five years ended December 31, 2012 was 100.0%, compared to the industry composite statutory combined ratio of 116.8% for the same five-year period (calculated by A.M. Best for individual companies that have more than 50% of their business in workers' compensation).

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)  
Employers Assurance Company (EAC)

Florida  
Florida

4

---

### 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.

The following table compares our statutory loss and loss adjustment expense (LAE) ratio, a measure which relates inversely to our underwriting profitability, to the statutory industry composite loss and LAE ratio reported by A.M. Best (calculated for U.S. insurance companies having more than 50% of their premiums generated by workers' compensation insurance products).

Year	Statutory Loss and LAE Ratio		
	EHI <sup>(1)</sup>	A.M. Best	
2008	51.4	% 78.6	%
2009	57.5	86.1	
2010	66.2	87.4	
2011	77.6	89.6	
2012	57.4	82.7	
2013	73.8	N/A <sup>(2)</sup>	

Our statutory loss and LAE ratio includes changes to reserves for losses and LAE established for prior periods and (1) the impact of \$27.5 million and \$100.0 million favorable adjustments to the ceded reserves under the Loss

Portfolio Transfer Agreement for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively.

(2) As of the date of this report, statutory industry composite loss and LAE ratio data was not available for 2013.

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

### Explanation of Responses:

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.

5

---

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 affiliated with Anthem Blue Cross of California (Anthem) and Coventry Health Care, Inc. 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, 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 consistently 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	2013	Percentage of 2013 Total	2012	Percentage of 2012 Total	2011	Percentage of 2011 Total
	(in thousands, except percentages)					
A	\$146,263	23.7	% \$120,863	22.5	% \$70,398	17.9
B	130,009	21.1	136,849	25.5	95,783	24.3
C	239,497	38.8	182,416	33.9	145,282	36.9
D	80,910	13.1	77,148	14.4	58,534	14.9

Explanation of Responses:

Edgar Filing: LaNeve Stephen - Form 4

E	18,557	3.0	15,850	2.9	19,094	4.8	
F	2,122	0.3	4,128	0.8	4,682	1.2	
G	66	<0.1	88	<0.1	148	<0.1	
Total	\$617,424	100.0	% \$537,342	100.0	% \$393,921	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, 2013 were as follows:

Employer Classifications	In-force Premiums (in thousands, except percentages)	Percentage of Total	
Restaurants	\$147,888	24.0	%
Dentists, Optometrists, and Physicians	41,986	6.8	
Automobile Service or Repair Shops	40,578	6.6	
Hotels, Motels, and Clubs	37,479	6.1	
Wholesale Stores	27,686	4.5	
Gasoline Stations	23,933	3.9	
Real Estate Management	20,370	3.3	
Apparel Manufacturing	16,080	2.6	
Schools – Colleges and Religious Organizations	15,848	2.6	
Groceries and Provisions	14,781	2.4	
Total	\$386,629	62.8	%

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, 2013, our policyholders had average annual in-force premiums of \$7,345. 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 by select states were as follows as of December 31:

State	2013		2012		2011	
	In-force Premiums	Policies In-force	In-force Premiums	Policies In-force	In-force Premiums	Policies In-force
	(dollars in thousands)					
California	\$367,813	48,032	\$317,890	46,829	\$221,910	36,867
Illinois	30,795	3,184	30,555	3,302	24,744	2,433
Georgia	25,565	3,762	22,985	3,150	16,393	2,050
Florida	19,897	3,270	17,676	2,918	15,226	2,399
North Carolina	15,615	2,112	12,421	1,629	7,315	1,026
Other	157,739	23,696	135,815	21,986	108,333	15,918
Total	\$617,424	84,056	\$537,342	79,814	\$393,921	60,693

The following trends affected our workers' compensation business from 2011 through 2013:

• In-force premiums increased 56.7%, primarily due to an increasing number of policies in-force and higher premium rates; and

• Total policies in-force increased 38.5%, reflecting our efforts to continue to grow our business profitably across market cycles.

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.

7

---

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. According to the Workers' Compensation Insurance Rating Bureau, the cost savings are expected to be achieved through a number of measures, including: the creation of a new dispute resolution process outside of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board for medical treatments and billing issues; new controls on liens; and calls for new fee schedules for physicians, interpreters, ambulatory surgery centers, and home health care.

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 will evaluate SB 863's mandated regulations as they are adopted and will adjust our rate filings as indicated. We can offer no assurance that SB 863 will result in any cost savings for us or any indication as to when, if ever, any cost savings might occur.

Our net rate (total in-force premiums divided by total insured payroll exposure) increased 12.9%, 13.7%, and 12.0% in California during the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, 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 schedule rating, changes to filed rates, and experience modifiers. In 2014, we will leverage territorial multipliers and multiple insurance subsidiaries, each with different rate filings, to provide additional pricing options in California.

#### 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 10 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 2013 for EICN and ECIC, and for each of the years ended December 31, 2008 through December 31, 2012 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: LaNeve Stephen - Form 4

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
	(in thousands)									
Net reserves for losses and LAE Originally estimated	\$962,457	\$1,089,814	\$1,208,481	\$1,209,652	\$1,217,069	\$1,430,128	\$1,373,153	\$1,323,686	\$1,331,523	\$1,426,1
Net cumulative amounts paid as of:										
One year later	91,130	96,661	106,859	109,129	127,912	214,499	206,653	218,569	225,541	261,729
Two years later	150,391	161,252	175,531	186,014	219,496	342,174	361,048	371,065	390,536	
Three years later	193,766	207,868	229,911	249,059	295,646	449,914	472,831	485,580		
Four years later	226,127	247,217	279,405	302,863	354,867	532,107	557,760			
Five years later	255,851	285,388	321,060	345,801	405,556	598,534				
Six years later	288,039	317,489	354,765	384,509	448,122					
Seven years later	315,180	344,968	384,899	417,572						
Eight years later	338,611	369,270	412,240							
Nine years later	359,537	392,492								
Ten years later	379,874									
Net reserves re-estimated as of:										
One year later	924,878	1,011,759	1,101,352	1,149,641	1,151,246	1,378,769	1,359,023	1,324,813	1,333,323	1,433,21
Two years later	886,711	975,765	1,049,628	1,085,358	1,100,706	1,352,021	1,340,366	1,313,064	1,334,008	
Three years later	884,426	954,660	1,004,589	1,035,028	1,079,913	1,319,989	1,324,835	1,312,313		
Four years later	877,151	927,382	970,671	1,010,407	1,046,648	1,303,044	1,305,228			
Five years later	858,617	900,588	949,446	973,921	1,038,650	1,277,675				
Six years later	839,430	883,388	917,843	962,798	1,004,408					
Seven years later	826,608	855,070	907,593	921,902						
Eight years later	804,958	849,217	869,828							
	800,187	810,817								

Explanation of Responses:

Edgar Filing: LaNeve Stephen - Form 4

Nine years later											
Ten years later	767,002										
Net cumulative redundancy (deficiency):	195,455	278,997	338,653	287,750	212,661	152,453	67,925	11,373	(2,485)	(7,056)	
Gross reserves - December 31	2,193,439	2,284,542	2,349,981	2,307,755	2,269,710	2,506,478	2,425,658	2,279,729	2,272,363	2,231,541	
Reinsurance recoverable, gross	1,230,982	1,194,728	1,141,500	1,098,103	1,052,641	1,076,350	1,052,505	956,043	940,840	805,386	
Net reserves - December 31	962,457	1,089,814	1,208,481	1,209,652	1,217,069	1,430,128	1,373,153	1,323,686	1,331,523	1,426,155	
Gross re-estimated reserves	1,823,932	1,824,090	1,846,283	1,857,243	1,906,181	2,194,756	2,185,507	2,136,227	2,123,372	2,196,051	
Re-estimated reinsurance recoverables	1,056,930	1,013,273	976,455	935,341	901,773	917,081	880,279	823,914	789,364	762,841	
Net re-estimated reserves	767,002	810,817	869,828	921,902	1,004,408	1,277,675	1,305,228	1,312,313	1,334,008	1,433,210	
Gross reserves for losses and LAE											
Originally estimated	2,193,439	2,284,542	2,349,981	2,307,755	2,269,710	2,506,478	2,425,658	2,279,729	2,272,363	2,231,541	
Gross cumulative amounts paid as of:											
One year later	137,968	142,632	152,006	152,879	170,626	258,412	269,771	260,799	263,605	296,859	
Two years later	243,203	252,379	264,430	272,478	304,146	449,206	466,398	451,359	463,730		
Three years later	331,731	342,748	361,524	377,459	422,862	599,176	616,244	601,004			
Four years later	407,845	424,811	452,955	473,828	522,296	719,433	736,304				
Five years later	480,283	504,918	537,175	556,978	609,775	820,991					
Six years later	554,408	579,585	611,093	632,477	686,064						
Seven years later	624,114	647,276	677,472	699,264							
Eight years later	687,757	707,823	738,678								
Nine years later	744,928	764,910									

Explanation of Responses:

Edgar Filing: LaNeve Stephen - Form 4

Ten years later	799,130									
Gross reserves re-estimated as of:										
One year later	2,148,829	2,178,514	2,233,077	2,233,176	2,200,689	2,470,746	2,373,479	2,299,653	2,164,595	2,196,050
Two years later	2,088,437	2,138,648	2,170,292	2,162,695	2,148,399	2,405,837	2,370,646	2,178,129	2,123,372	
Three years later	2,084,764	2,110,481	2,119,764	2,110,615	2,110,230	2,386,424	2,245,496	2,136,227		
Four years later	2,072,428	2,078,223	2,084,854	2,074,466	2,094,050	2,259,994	2,185,507			
Five years later	2,050,124	2,050,937	2,053,869	2,050,177	1,983,158	2,194,756				
Six years later	2,030,945	2,027,187	2,027,729	1,936,441	1,906,181					
Seven years later	2,011,945	2,001,243	1,918,261	1,857,243						
Eight years later	1,990,684	1,895,418	1,846,283							
Nine years later	1,885,825	1,824,090								
Ten years later	1,823,932									
Gross cumulative redundancy:	\$369,507	\$460,452	\$503,698	\$450,512	\$363,529	\$311,722	\$240,151	\$143,502	\$148,991	\$35,489

## 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. In accordance 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. 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, 2013 and 12:01 a.m. July 1, 2014. 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 2007 (TRIPRA). 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 or civil unrest other than terrorism; 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. Risks written outside the reinsurance program generally require executive review and approval.

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 \$612.1 million and \$672.3 million, as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively. (See Note 11 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements) Losses and LAE paid with respect to the LPT Agreement totaled approximately \$637.9 million and \$605.1 million through December 31, 2013 and 2012, 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, 2013 and 2012 was \$1.3 billion and \$1.0 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, 2013, our estimate of ultimate expected contingent profit commission was \$49.8 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 generally large, well-capitalized reinsurance companies. At December 31, 2013, \$1.3 billion was in trust accounts for reinsurance related to the LPT Agreement and an additional \$5.8 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, 2013.

Reinsurer	A.M. Best Rating <sup>(1)</sup>	Total Paid	Total Unpaid Losses and LAE	Total
(in thousands)				
ACE Bermuda Insurance Limited	A+	\$792	\$61,207	\$61,999
ACE Property & Casualty Insurance Company	A+	—	2,018	2,018
American Healthcare Indemnity Company	B++	10	1,881	1,891
Aspen Insurance UK Limited	A	20	7,740	7,760
Everest Reinsurance Company	A+	26	2,412	2,438
Finial Reinsurance	A-	7	3,998	4,005
Hannover Rueckversicherung-AG	A+	48	19,471	19,519
Lloyds Syndicates	A	24	52,770	52,794
Markel Bermuda Ltd	A	29	3,283	3,312
Munich Reinsurance America, Inc	A+	41	7,806	7,847
National Indemnity Company	A++	4,356	336,640	340,996
National Union Fire Insurance Co of Pittsburg	A	9	1,349	1,358
Partner Reinsurance Europe plc	A+	35	1,822	1,857
Relia Star Life Insurance Company	A	55	2,174	2,229
ST Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Company	A+	21	3,049	3,070
Swiss Reinsurance America Corporation	A+	52	9,434	9,486
Tokio Marine & Nichido Fire Insurance Ltd (US)	A++	70	6,637	6,707
XL Re Limited	A	2,772	214,226	216,998
All Other	Various	45	4,749	4,794
Total		\$8,412	\$742,666	\$751,078

<sup>(1)</sup> 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, 2013, less than 0.1% of our reinsurance recoverables on paid losses were greater than 90 days overdue.



#### Inter-Company Reinsurance Pooling Agreement

Our insurance subsidiaries are parties to an inter-company pooling agreement for statutory reporting purposes. Under this agreement, the results of underwriting operations of each company are transferred to and combined with those of the others and the combined results are then reapportioned. The allocations under the pooling agreement are as follows:

EICN — 53%

ECIC — 27%

EPIC — 10%

EAC — 10%

Transactions under the pooling agreement are eliminated in consolidation and have no impact on our consolidated GAAP financial statements.

#### Investments

As of December 31, 2013, the total amortized cost of our investment portfolio was \$2.2 billion and the fair value of the portfolio was \$2.3 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; through our strategic partnerships and alliances, including our principal partners ADP, Inc. (ADP) and Anthem; and through relationships with 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 4,693 independent agencies that marketed and sold our insurance products at December 31, 2013.

Independent agencies generated 76.7%, 77.0%, and 75.7% of in-force premiums at December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively, and our largest agency generated 0.9% of in-force premiums at each of December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011.

#### Strategic Partnerships and Alliances

We have developed important strategic relationships with companies that have established sales forces and common markets to expand our reach to alternative distribution channels. We jointly market our workers' compensation insurance products with ADP's payroll services and with Anthem's group health insurance plans. Additionally, we have entered into other strategic partnerships and alliances with payroll service providers and insurance brokerages. These relationships have allowed us to access new customers and to write attractive business in an efficient manner, and we are actively pursuing additional strategic partnership and alliance opportunities. We do not delegate

underwriting authority to our strategic distribution partners.

Our strategic partnerships and alliances generated 23.0%, 22.6%, and 23.8% of our in-force premiums as of December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively.

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. The majority of business written is 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.

ADP markets workers' compensation insurance using its the Pay-by-Pay<sup>®</sup> (PBP) program. An advantage of ADP's PBP program is that the policyholder is not required to pay a deposit at the inception of the policy. The workers' compensation premium is deducted each time ADP processes the policyholder's payrolls along with its appropriate federal, state, and local taxes. These characteristics of the PBP program enable us to competitively price the workers' compensation insurance written as a part of that program.

Our relationship with ADP is non-exclusive; however, we believe we are a key strategic 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.

Anthem. The Integrated MediComp<sup>SM</sup> joint marketing program is an exclusive relationship that allows us to combine our workers' compensation product with Anthem's group health coverage through a single bill in most cases. We believe that, in general, when businesses purchase this combination of coverage, their employees make fewer workers' compensation claims because those employees are insured for non-work related illnesses or injuries and thus are less likely to seek treatment for a non-work related illness or injury through their employers' workers' compensation insurance policy. As the largest group health carrier in California, Anthem has negotiated favorable rates with its medical providers and associated facilities, which we benefit from through reduced claims costs. We pay Anthem fees that are a percentage of premiums received for services provided under the Integrated MediComp program.

Our agreement with Anthem automatically renews for one-year periods unless terminated by either party with at least 60 days notice prior to the expiration of the then current term and has been renewed through January 1, 2015.

#### 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 The Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc., Travelers Insurance Group Holdings, Inc., Zurich Insurance Group Ltd., and Berkshire Hathaway Homestate Companies.

We work with many of the nation's top independent agents and brokers to deliver competitively-priced products and exceptional service to our policyholders. Through strategic partnerships and alliances, we are able to offer policyholders value-added, bundled products and services. Our first-rate claims management and our hands-on team of managed care and loss prevention specialists provide a level of service that differentiates us from our competitors. The workers' compensation sector continued to see average medical and indemnity claims costs increase in 2012, 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 an increase in indemnity claim frequency that was "significantly above projected levels" for the first half of 2013. The WCIRB attributed this increase to late reported claims, cumulative injuries, increased benefits associated with SB 863, geographical 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.

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 16 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 13 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, 2013, 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.

#### Federal Regulation

We are affected by a variety of federal legislative and regulatory measures and judicial decisions.

The Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (the 2002 Act) was enacted in November 2002. The principal purpose of the 2002 Act was to create a role for the Federal government in the provision of insurance for losses sustained in connection with foreign terrorism. The 2002 Act was extended by TRIPRA, with the inclusion of some adjustments. 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 any one claimant. Our reinsurance policies exclude coverage for losses arising out of nuclear, biological, chemical or radiological attacks. Under TRIPRA, federal protection may be provided to the insurance industry for certain acts of foreign and domestic terrorism, including nuclear, biological, chemical or radiological attacks. TRIPRA is scheduled to expire on December 31, 2014.

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.

#### 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.

Difficult conditions in the economy and capital markets may adversely affect our profitability, financial condition, and results of operations.

The financial market volatility experienced worldwide that began in 2008 continued into 2013. Although the U.S. and foreign governments have taken various actions to stabilize financial markets, it is uncertain whether those actions

will be effective over the long-term. Financial market volatility could continue, resulting in a prolonged negative economic impact.

We cannot predict future market conditions or their impact on our stock price, investment portfolio, or our workers' compensation business. In addition, continuing financial market volatility and economic downturn could have a material adverse affect on our insureds, agents, claimants, reinsurers, vendors, and competitors. Depending on financial market conditions, we could incur additional realized and unrealized losses in the future in our investment portfolio, which could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations and financial condition.

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, 2013, 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, 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 60% of our in-force premiums as of December 31, 2013. 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. The economic condition of the state has resulted in high unemployment and 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. Because our business is concentrated in this manner, 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 strategic partners.

We have agreements with two principal strategic partners, ADP and Anthem, to market and service our insurance products through their sales forces and insurance agencies. ADP and Anthem generated 10.7% and 9.2%, respectively, of our total in-force premiums as of December 31, 2013. Our agreement with ADP is not exclusive, and ADP may terminate the agreement without cause upon 120 days notice. Although our distribution agreements with Anthem are exclusive, Anthem may terminate its agreements with us if our A.M. Best financial strength rating were downgraded

and we are not able to provide coverage through a carrier with an A.M. Best financial strength rating of “B++” (Good) or better. Anthem may also terminate its agreements with us without cause upon 60 days notice. The termination of any of our principal strategic partnership agreements, our failure to maintain good relationships with our principal strategic partners, or their 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 our principal strategic partners may face financial difficulties, reputational issues, or problems with respect to their own products and services, which may lead to decreased sales of our products and services. Moreover, if either of our principal strategic partners consolidates or aligns itself with another company or changes its products that are currently offered with our workers' compensation insurance product, we may lose business or suffer decreased revenues.

We are also subject to credit risk with respect to ADP and Anthem, as they collect premiums on our behalf for the workers' compensation products that are marketed together with their 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.

One of our strategic partners, Anthem, requires that we offer workers' compensation coverage through a carrier with a financial strength rating of "B++" (Good) or better by A.M. Best. Our inability to offer such coverage could cause a reduction in the number of policies we write. If our financial strength rating were downgraded, and we were not able to enter into an agreement to provide coverage through a carrier rated "B++" (Good) or better by A.M. Best, Anthem could terminate its distribution agreements with us. We cannot assure you that we would be able to enter such an agreement if our rating was downgraded.

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, 2013, we had \$751 million of reinsurance recoverables for paid and unpaid losses and LAE, of which \$8 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, 2013, we entered into a new reinsurance program that is effective through June 30, 2014. 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 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 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

18

---

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, 2013, the estimated remaining liabilities subject to the LPT Agreement were \$612 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, 2013 was \$1.3 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 \$1.1 billion at December 31, 2013, in a trust to secure the reinsurer's obligation of \$337 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 spread 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 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 EHL.

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, 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 and could suffer substantial losses as a result. TRIPRA will expire on December 31, 2014.

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, and disability ratings. 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 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 William E. Yocke, 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, 2014, we leased 235,377 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 1,216 holders of record as of February 13, 2014. High and low sales prices and cash dividends declared for the last two fiscal years were as follows:

Quarter Ended	2013 Stock Price		Cash Dividends Declared	2012 Stock Price		Cash Dividends Declared
	High	Low		High	Low	
March 31	\$23.58	\$23.15	\$0.06	\$19.00	\$15.89	\$0.06
June 30	25.92	25.51	0.06	18.14	16.46	0.06
September 30	29.93	24.26	0.06	19.41	17.07	0.06
December 31	32.90	27.77	0.06	20.74	17.50	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, 2013.

## 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, 2008 and ending on December 31, 2013 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					
	12/31/2008	12/31/2009	12/31/2010	12/31/2011	12/31/2012	12/31/2013
Employers Holdings, Inc.	100.00	94.89	109.84	115.40	133.10	206.59
S&P 500	100.00	126.46	145.51	148.59	172.37	228.19
S&P P&C Insurance Index	100.00	112.35	122.39	122.08	146.63	202.78

25

---

## 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,				
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
Income Statement Data	(in thousands, except per share amounts and ratios)				
Revenues:	(unaudited)				
Net premiums earned	\$642,349	\$501,464	\$363,424	\$321,786	\$404,247
Net investment income	70,764	72,363	80,117	83,032	90,484
Realized gains on investments, net	9,529	5,048	20,161	10,137	791
Other income	939	307	452	649	413
Total revenues	723,581	579,182	464,154	415,604	495,935
Net income before income taxes	53,174	97,544	46,517	66,992	84,023
Income tax (benefit) expense	(10,650 )	(9,347 )	(2,106 )	3,523	9,277
Net income	\$63,824	\$106,891	\$48,623	\$63,469	\$74,746
Earnings per common share					
Basic	\$2.05	\$3.40	\$1.30	\$1.53	\$1.63
Diluted	2.00	3.37	1.30	1.53	1.62
Selected Operating Data					
Gross premiums written <sup>(1)</sup>	\$689,870	\$580,327	\$418,512	\$322,277	\$379,949
Net premiums written <sup>(2)</sup>	\$678,466	\$569,676	\$410,038	\$313,098	\$368,290
Combined ratio <sup>(3)</sup>	103.9 %	95.3 %	113.9 %	106.6 %	100.1 %
Net income before impact of the LPT Agreement <sup>(4)(5)(6)</sup>	\$25,890	\$6,957	\$29,324	\$43,754	\$49,989
Earnings per common share before impact of the LPT Agreement <sup>(6)</sup>					
Basic	\$0.83	\$0.22	\$0.79	\$1.06	1.09
Diluted	0.81	0.22	0.78	1.06	1.08
Cash dividends declared per common share	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24
	As of December 31,				
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
Balance Sheet Data	(in thousands)				
	(unaudited)				
Cash and cash equivalents	\$34,503	\$140,661	\$252,300	\$119,825	\$188,883
Total investments	2,344,858	2,149,514	1,950,745	2,080,494	2,029,560
Reinsurance recoverable on paid and unpaid losses	751,078	814,853	951,569	970,458	1,064,843
Total assets	3,643,449	3,511,339	3,482,310	3,480,665	3,677,248
Unpaid losses and loss adjustment expense	2,330,491	2,231,540	2,272,363	2,279,729	2,425,658
Deferred reinsurance gain—LPT Agreement <sup>(4)(5)</sup>	249,072	281,043	365,963	383,399	402,352
Notes payable	102,000	112,000	122,000	132,000	132,000
Total liabilities	3,074,746	2,971,958	3,020,327	3,003,062	3,192,032
Total equity	568,703	539,381	461,983	477,603	485,216
Other Financial Data					
Total equity including deferred reinsurance gain—LPT Agreement <sup>(4)(5)(7)</sup>	\$817,775	\$820,424	\$827,946	\$861,002	\$887,568

(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 11 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements.)

Combined ratio is the sum of the losses and LAE expense, the commission expense, dividends to policyholders,  
(3) and the underwriting and other operating expenses, all divided by net earned premiums. 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,				
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
	(in thousands)				
Net income	\$63,824	\$106,891	\$48,623	\$63,469	\$74,746
Less amortization of the Deferred Gain related to losses	12,890	15,393	17,147	18,233	18,007
Less amortization of the Deferred Gain related to contingent commission	1,710	1,583	1,102	1,090	1,043
Less impact of LPT Reserve Adjustments <sup>(a)</sup>	18,986	73,349	—	—	—
Less impact of LPT Contingent Commission Adjustments <sup>(b)</sup>	4,348	9,609	1,050	392	5,707
Net income before impact of the LPT Agreement	\$25,890	\$6,957	\$29,324	\$43,754	\$49,989

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 (a) 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 (b) 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.)

(7)

## Edgar Filing: LaNeve Stephen - Form 4

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,				
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
	(in thousands)				
Total equity	\$568,703	\$539,381	\$461,983	\$477,603	\$485,216
Deferred Gain	249,072	281,043	365,963	383,399	402,352
Total equity including the Deferred Gain	\$817,775	\$820,424	\$827,946	\$861,002	\$887,568

## 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 \$63.8 million, \$106.9 million, and \$48.6 million in 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively and we recognized underwriting income (losses) of \$(24.8) million, \$23.3 million, and \$(50.6) 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 2013 and 2012, each compared to the previous year, respectively, include:

• Gross premiums written increased 19% and 39%;

• Net premiums earned increased 28% and 38%;

• Losses and LAE increased 61% and 10%;

• Underwriting and other operating expenses increased 1% and 20%; and

• Income tax benefit increased \$1.3 million to \$10.7 million in 2013, compared to 2012, and increased \$7.2 million to \$9.3 million in 2012, compared to 2011.

Our 2013 results of operations were also impacted by: (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.

Our 2012 results of operations were also impacted by: (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. For the year ended December 31, 2013, the unrealized gain in our portfolio, net of deferred tax expense, declined by \$39.1 million, principally as a result of the upward movement in interest rates during the year. 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:

	2013	2012
	(in thousands, except share data)	
Stockholders' equity including the Deferred Gain <sup>(1)</sup>	\$817,775	\$820,424
GAAP stockholders' equity	\$568,703	\$539,381
Common shares outstanding	31,299,930	30,771,479

(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 goal is to maintain our focus on disciplined underwriting and to continue to pursue profitable growth opportunities across market cycles; however, we continue to be affected by persistently low investment yields and continuing high levels of unemployment nationally. We believe overall economic conditions will remain uncertain in the near-term.

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

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
	(in thousands)		
Net premiums earned	\$642,349	\$501,464	\$363,424
Net investment income	70,764	72,363	80,117
Realized gains on investments, net	9,529	5,048	20,161
Other income	939	307	452
Total revenues	723,581	579,182	464,154
Losses and LAE	463,579	287,910	262,511
Commission expense	78,258	65,580	47,344
Underwriting and other operating expenses	125,324	124,644	104,140
Interest expense	3,246	3,504	3,642
Income tax benefit	(10,650)	(9,347)	(2,106)
Total expenses	659,757	472,291	415,531
Net income	\$63,824	\$106,891	\$48,623
Less amortization of the Deferred Gain related to losses	12,890	15,393	17,147
Less amortization of the Deferred Gain related to contingent commission	1,710	1,583	1,102
Less impact of LPT Reserve Adjustments <sup>(1)</sup>	18,986	73,349	—
Less impact of LPT Contingent Commission Adjustments <sup>(2)</sup>	4,348	9,609	1,050
Net income before impact of the LPT Agreement <sup>(3)</sup>	\$25,890	\$6,957	\$29,324

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 (1) 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.)

(2) 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. (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.

#### Net Premiums Earned

Net premiums earned were \$642.3 million, \$501.5 million, and \$363.4 million for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, 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, 2013 and 2012, respectively, overall and for California, where 60% of our premiums are generated:

	Percentage Increase 2013 Over 2012		Percentage Increase 2012 Over 2011	
	Overall	California	Overall	California
In-force premiums	14.9	% 15.7	% 36.4	% 43.3
In-force policy count	5.3	2.6	31.5	27.0
Average in-force policy size	9.1	12.8	3.7	12.8
In-force payroll exposure	5.7	2.5	25.9	26.0
Net rate <sup>(1)</sup>	8.8	12.9	8.3	13.7

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.

We expect that total premiums in 2014 across our markets will reflect overall net rate increases and increasing average policy size.

#### 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 \$70.8 million, \$72.4 million, and \$80.1 million for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively. The decrease in net investment income over the past three years was primarily related to a decrease in the average pre-tax book yield on invested assets. The average pre-tax book yield on invested assets was 3.4%, 3.7%, and 4.1% at December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively, while the tax-equivalent yield on invested assets was 4.0%, 4.4%, and 5.0% 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 \$9.5 million, \$5.0 million, and \$20.2 million for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively. The net realized gains on investments for the year ended December 31, 2011 were higher as a result of a strategic rebalancing of our investment portfolio to increase portfolio

allocations to taxable fixed income sectors, shorten portfolio duration following the decline in interest rates in the second half of 2011, and increase the allocation to high dividend equity securities. Additional information regarding our Investments is set forth under “–Liquidity and Capital Resources–Investments.”

Combined Ratio

The combined ratio, expressed as a percentage, is a key measurement of underwriting profitability. The combined ratio 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 recorded an underwriting loss, and are dependent upon investment income to be profitable. 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,			
	2013	2012	2011	
Loss and LAE ratio	72.2	% 57.4	% 72.2	%
Underwriting and other operating expenses ratio	19.5	24.8	28.7	
Commission expense ratio	12.2	13.1	13.0	
Combined ratio	103.9	% 95.3	% 113.9	%

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 increased year-over-year and 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 claims litigation, driven by a nearly eight percentage point increase in the number of claims that are 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. These trends are consistent with those reported by the Workers' Compensation Insurance Rating Bureau in California through the third quarter of 2013. 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 \$463.6 million, \$287.9 million, and \$262.5 million for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively. The increase from 2012 to 2013 was primarily due to higher net premiums earned in 2013. The increase from 2011 to 2012 was primarily due to an increase in net earned premiums. Additionally, there was a \$73.3 million favorable LPT Reserve Adjustment and \$9.6 million in LPT Contingent Commission Adjustments that decreased losses and LAE by those amounts in 2012. 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 2012 and 2011 was primarily related to our assigned risk business. Our current accident year loss estimates were 77.0%, 77.0%, and 77.2% for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively. The trend in the current accident year loss estimates reflects the impact of higher net rate, which is being offset by increasing loss costs.

Excluding the impact from the LPT Agreement, losses and LAE would have been \$501.5 million, \$387.8 million, and \$281.8 million, or 78.1%, 77.3%, and 77.5% of net premiums earned, for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively.

The table below reflects losses and LAE reserve adjustments.

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
	(in thousands)		
Prior accident year (unfavorable) favorable development, net	\$ (6,934 )	\$ (1,800 )	\$ (1,127 )
Amortization of the Deferred Gain related to losses	\$ 12,890	\$ 15,393	\$ 17,147
Amortization of the Deferred Gain related to contingent commission	1,710	1,583	1,102
Impact of LPT Reserve Adjustments	18,986	73,349	—
Impact of LPT Contingent Commission Adjustments	4,348	9,609	1,050

**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 19.5%, 24.8%, and 28.7%, and our underwriting and other operating expenses was \$125.3 million, \$124.6 million, and \$104.1 million for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively. 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. During the year ended December 31, 2012, bonus and equity compensation expenses increased \$7.2 million, our premium taxes and assessments increased \$1.7 million (including a \$1.4 million change in estimate for guarantee fund assessments), and bad debt expense increased \$2.1 million, partially offset by a \$1.6 million decrease in professional fees, compared to 2011.

Additionally, implementation of the new accounting guidance for deferred policy acquisition costs (DAC) resulted in a \$7.1 million increase in our underwriting and other operating expenses for the year ended December 31, 2012.

Excluding the impact of the new DAC guidance and the change in estimate for guarantee fund assessments, underwriting and other operating expenses would have increased \$6.4 million for the year ended December 31, 2013 compared to 2012 and \$14.8 million for the year ended December 31, 2012 compared to 2011.

**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 12.2%, 13.1%, and 13.0%, while our commission expense was \$78.3 million, \$65.6 million, and \$47.3 million for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively. While our commission expense is up over the past three years, primarily due to higher net premiums earned, our commission expense ratio decreased in 2013, primarily due to lower base commissions and agency incentives as a percentage of premiums earned, compared to 2012 and 2011.

#### Interest Expense

We incur interest expenses on notes payable. Interest expense was \$3.2 million, \$3.5 million, and \$3.6 million for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively. The decrease in interest expense from 2011 to 2013

was primarily due to the reduction in principal balance on our credit facility with Wells Fargo by \$10 million in the fourth quarters of each of 2013 and 2012.

32

---

#### Income Tax Benefit

Income tax benefit was \$10.7 million, \$9.3 million, and \$2.1 million for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively. The effective tax rate was (20.0)%, (9.6)%, and (4.5)% for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively. 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.

The increased tax benefit for the year ended December 31, 2012, compared to 2011, was primarily due to increases in tax exempt income as a percentage of pre-tax net income, resulting from a \$73.3 million favorable LPT Reserve Adjustment and a \$15.0 million increase to the LPT contingent profit commission in 2012.

#### Liquidity and Capital Resources

##### Parent Company

**Operating Cash and Cash Equivalents.** 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 2014, without prior approval by the respective state insurance regulator, are \$32.7 million and \$25.4 million, respectively.

The holding company had \$56.5 million of cash and cash equivalents and fixed maturity securities maturing within the next 24 months at December 31, 2013. Principal payments of \$10 million and \$60 million on our line of credit are payable on December 31, 2014 and 2015, respectively. 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.

**Outstanding Debt.** In December 2010, we entered into the Third Amended and Restated Credit Agreement with Wells Fargo (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 \$95.1 million and \$110.4 million at December 31, 2013 and 2012, 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 31, 2013.

Our total outstanding debt was \$102.0 million and \$112.0 million as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively. Interest and fees on debt obligations totaled \$3.2 million, \$3.5 million, and \$3.6 million in 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively.

Our capital structure is comprised of outstanding debt and stockholders' equity. As of December 31, 2013, our capital structure consisted of a \$70.0 million principal balance on our Amended Credit Facility, \$32.0 million in surplus notes maturing in 2034, and \$817.8 million of stockholders' equity, including the Deferred Gain. Outstanding debt was 11.1% of total capitalization, including the Deferred Gain, as of December 31, 2013.

##### Operating Subsidiaries

Operating Cash and Cash Equivalents. 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.

33

---

Our insurance subsidiaries had \$336.7 million of cash and cash equivalents and fixed maturity securities maturing within the next 24 months at December 31, 2013. 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, 2013, we entered into a new reinsurance program that is effective through June 30, 2014. 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 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, 2013.

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 \$602.4 million and \$530.6 million were on deposit at December 31, 2013 and 2012, 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. The fair value of securities held in trust for the benefit of ceding reinsurers was \$32.2 million and \$35.0 million at December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively.

#### Cash Flows

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.

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
Cash and cash equivalents provided by (used in):	(in thousands)		
Operating activities	\$ 163,725	\$ 131,249	\$ 42,384
Investing activities	(258,890 )	(184,424 )	199,990
Financing activities	(10,993 )	(58,464 )	(109,899 )
(Decrease) increase in cash and cash equivalents	\$(106,158 )	\$(111,639 )	\$132,475

Operating Activities. Major components of net cash provided by operating activities in 2013 included net premiums received of \$624.0 million, investment income received of \$78.8 million, and amounts recovered from reinsurers of \$33.1 million. These were partially offset by claims payments of \$365.9 million, 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, investment income received of \$79.6 million, and amounts recovered from reinsurers of \$38.2 million. These were partially offset by claims payments of \$315.1 million, 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.

Major components of net cash provided by operating activities in 2011 included net premiums received of \$358.4 million, investment income received of \$90.8 million, and amounts recovered from reinsurers of \$46.1 million. These were partially offset by claims payments of \$316.4 million, underwriting and other operating expenses paid of \$93.7 million (including \$7.6 million of premium taxes paid), and commissions paid of \$36.3 million.

Investing Activities. The majority of net cash used in investing activities in 2013 and 2012 was related to the investment of premiums received and the reinvestment of funds from maturities and redemptions. The major sources of net cash provided by investing activities in 2011 were the sale of certain fixed maturity securities and from maturities and redemptions of other investments during the year.

Financing Activities. The majority of cash used in financing activities in 2013 was to pay stockholder dividends and to pay down \$10 million on the line of credit provided by the Amended Credit Facility. The majority of cash used in financing activities in 2012 and 2011 was to repurchase \$41.8 million and \$92.0 million of our common stock, respectively, to pay dividends to

stockholders, and to pay down \$10.0 million on the line of credit provided by the Amended Credit Facility in each of 2012 and 2011.

#### Investments

The cost or amortized cost of our investment portfolio was \$2.21 billion and the fair value was \$2.34 billion as of December 31, 2013.

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, 2013, our investment portfolio, which is classified as available-for-sale, consisted of 93.1% 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 4.2 at December 31, 2013. 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, 2013, with 59.0% 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 6.9% of our investment portfolio at December 31, 2013.

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 reevaluated 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. These services include investment accounting and company modeling using Dynamic Financial Analysis (DFA). The DFA tool is utilized to develop portfolio targets and objectives, which in turn are used in constructing an optimal portfolio.

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, 2013.

Category	Estimated Fair Value	Percentage of Total	Book Yield	Tax Equivalent Yield
	(in thousands, except percentages)			
U.S. Treasuries	\$170,897	7.3	% 2.0	% 2.0
U.S. Agencies	68,118	2.9	2.7	2.7
States and municipalities	735,180	31.4	3.8	5.5
Corporate securities	833,296	35.5	3.4	3.4
Residential mortgaged-backed securities	258,431	11.0	3.6	3.6
Commercial mortgaged-backed securities	65,110	2.8	2.7	2.7
Asset-backed securities	51,514	2.2	0.9	0.9
Equity securities	162,312	6.9	4.3	5.7
Total investments	\$2,344,858	100.0	%	
Weighted average yield			3.4	% 4.0



The following table shows the percentage of total estimated fair value of our fixed maturity securities as of December 31, 2013 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"	10.8	%
"AA"	48.2	
"A"	27.7	
"BBB"	13.1	
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 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, 2013 and 2012. 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 \$0.1 million and \$0.7 million in the fair values of one and eleven equity securities for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively, as a result of the severity and duration of the change in fair values of those securities.

Edgar Filing: LaNeve Stephen - Form 4

The cost or amortized cost, gross unrealized gains, gross unrealized losses, and estimated fair value of our investments were as follows:

	Cost or Amortized Cost (in thousands)	Gross Unrealized Gains	Gross Unrealized Losses	Estimated Fair Value
At December 31, 2013				
Fixed maturity securities				
U.S. Treasuries	\$ 163,951	\$ 7,073	\$(127 )	\$ 170,897
U.S. Agencies	64,985	3,137	(4 )	68,118
States and municipalities	698,979	40,595	(4,394 )	735,180
Corporate securities	814,283	28,671	(9,658 )	833,296
Residential mortgage-backed securities	255,187	7,979	(4,735 )	258,431
Commercial mortgage-backed securities	67,066	316	(2,272 )	65,110
Asset-backed securities	51,613	54	(153 )	51,514
Total fixed maturity securities	2,116,064	87,825	(21,343 )	2,182,546
Equity securities	89,689	72,844	(221 )	162,312
Total investments	\$ 2,205,753	\$ 160,669	\$(21,564 )	\$ 2,344,858

At December 31, 2012				
Fixed maturity securities				
U.S. Treasuries	\$ 138,839	\$ 13,651	\$—	\$ 152,490
U.S. Agencies	88,202	5,765	—	93,967
States and municipalities	689,776	68,740	—	758,516
Corporate securities	627,047	49,461	(265 )	676,243
Residential mortgage-backed securities	236,461	16,488	(97 )	252,852
Commercial mortgage-backed securities	54,755	1,410	(45 )	56,120
Asset-backed securities	34,062	211	(33 )	34,240
Total fixed maturity securities	1,869,142	155,726	(440 )	2,024,428
Equity securities	81,067	45,399	(1,380 )	125,086
Total investments	\$ 1,950,209	\$ 201,125	\$(1,820 )	\$ 2,149,514

The amortized cost and estimated fair value of fixed maturity securities at December 31, 2013, by contractual maturity, are shown below. Expected maturities differ from contractual maturities because borrowers may have the right to call or prepay obligations with or without call or prepayment penalties.

	Amortized Cost (in thousands)	Estimated Fair Value
Due in one year or less	\$ 147,157	\$ 149,369
Due after one year through five years	777,480	812,822
Due after five years through ten years	655,280	676,124
Due after ten years	162,281	169,176
Mortgage and asset-backed securities	373,866	375,055
Total	\$ 2,116,064	\$ 2,182,546

Net realized and unrealized investment gains (losses) on fixed maturity and equity securities were as follows:

	December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
(in thousands)			
Net realized gains:			
Fixed maturity securities	\$ 754	\$ 3,774	\$ 19,315
Equity securities	8,775	1,274	846
	\$ 9,529	\$ 5,048	\$ 20,161

Change in unrealized (losses) gains:

Explanation of Responses:

Edgar Filing: LaNeve Stephen - Form 4

Fixed maturity securities	\$(88,803	) \$8,803	\$47,897
Equity securities	28,603	10,935	2,235
	\$(60,200	) \$19,738	\$50,132

37

---

Net investment income was as follows:

	December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
	(in thousands)		
Fixed maturity securities	\$69,458	\$71,293	\$80,361
Equity securities	3,812	3,248	1,885
Cash equivalents and restricted cash	99	351	279
	73,369	74,892	82,525
Investment expenses	(2,605	) (2,529	) (2,408
Net investment income	\$70,764	\$72,363	\$80,117

#### Contractual Obligations and Commitments

The following table identifies our long-term debt and contractual obligations as of December 31, 2013.

	Payment Due By Period				
	Total	Less Than 1-Year	1-3 Years	4-5 Years	More Than 5 Years
	(in thousands)				
Operating leases	\$16,641	\$6,044	\$8,012	\$2,585	\$—
Notes payable <sup>(1)</sup>	133,018	12,424	63,698	2,836	54,060
Capital leases	3,015	1,518	1,003	494	—
Losses and LAE reserves <sup>(2)(3)</sup>	2,330,491	335,031	388,897	238,241	1,368,322
Total contractual obligations	\$2,483,165	\$355,017	\$461,610	\$244,156	\$1,422,382

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, 2013. The interest rates range from 1.42% to 4.49%.

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, excluding bad debt allowance, on unpaid losses and LAE	\$(743,055	) \$(38,467	) \$(74,013	) \$(69,962	) \$(560,613

#### 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

38

---

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,	
	2013	2012
	(in thousands)	
Case reserves	\$1,019,174	\$955,715
IBNR	1,034,189	979,185
LAE	277,128	296,640
Gross unpaid losses and LAE	2,330,491	2,231,540
Less reinsurance recoverables on unpaid losses and LAE, gross	742,666	805,386
Net unpaid losses and LAE	\$1,587,825	\$1,426,154

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 liability for losses and LAE 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.

39

---

The Consulting Actuary determines its point estimate for EICN 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 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 claims. This paid data provides a stable base for estimation of reserves. The Consulting Actuary has provided us with a separate calculation for EICN 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, 2013 data, the method that uses explicit medical cost inflation assumptions included medical cost inflation assumptions ranging from 2.5% to 5.5%. 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 3.3% 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 3.7% 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 EICN based on paid loss methods, which our experience in Nevada indicates is more appropriate.

40

---

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

	As of December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
	(in thousands)		
Low end of actuarial range	\$1,466,005	\$1,307,873	\$1,227,199
Carried reserves	1,587,436	1,426,154	1,331,523
High end of actuarial range	1,815,094	1,620,565	1,471,971

As of December 31, 2013, California and Nevada represented approximately 79% of our reserves for unpaid losses and LAE on our consolidated balance sheet.

In California, where our operations began in 2002, the actuaries' and management's initial expectations of ultimate losses and patterns of loss emergence and payment were based on benchmarks derived from analyses of historical insurance industry data in California. No historical data from our California insurance subsidiary existed prior to July 1, 2002; however, some historical data was available for the prior years for some of the market segments we entered in California, but was limited as to the number of loss reserve evaluation points available. The industry-based benchmarks were judgmentally adjusted for the anticipated impact of significant environmental changes, specifically the enactment of major changes to the statutory workers' compensation benefit structure and the manner in which claims are administered and adjudicated in California. The actual emergence and payment of claims by our California insurance subsidiary has been more favorable than those initial expectations through 2008, due at least in part to the impact of the enactment of major changes in the California workers' compensation environment; however, our recent loss experience, beginning in 2010, indicates an upward trend in medical and indemnity costs that are reflected in our loss reserves. Additionally, our indemnity claims frequency (the number of claims expressed as a percentage of payroll) increased year-over-year in 2013. We assume that increasing medical cost trends will continue and will impact our long-term claims costs and loss reserves.

In Nevada, we have compiled a lengthy history of workers' compensation claims payment patterns based on the business of the Nevada State Industrial Insurance System (the Fund) and EICN, but the emergence and payment of claims in recent years has been more favorable than in the long-term history in Nevada with the Fund. The expected patterns of claim payments and emergence used in the projection of our ultimate claim payments are based on both long and short-term historical data. In recent evaluations, claim patterns have continued to emerge in a manner consistent with short-term historical data. Consequently, our selection of claim projection patterns has relied more heavily on patterns observed in recent years.

Our insurance subsidiaries have been operating in a period characterized by changing environmental conditions in our major markets, entry into new markets, and operational changes. During periods characterized by such changes, at each evaluation, the actuaries and management must make judgments as to the relative weight to accord to long-term historical and more recent company data, external data, evaluations of environmental and operational changes, and other factors in selecting the methods to use in projecting ultimate losses and LAE, the parameters to incorporate in those methods, and the relative weights to accord to the different projection indications. At each evaluation, management has given weight to new data, recent indications, and evaluations of environmental conditions and changes that implicitly reflect management's expectation as to the degree to which the future will resemble the most recent information and most recent changes, compared with long-term claim payment, claims emergence, and claim cost inflation patterns.

More than 59% of our claims payments during the three years ended December 31, 2013 related to medical care for injured workers. The utilization and cost of medical services in the future is a significant source of uncertainty in the establishment of loss reserves for workers' compensation. Our loss reserves are established based on reviewing the results of actuarial methods, some of which do not contain explicit medical claim cost inflation rates; however, because medical care may be provided to an injured worker over many years, and in some cases decades, the pace of medical claim cost inflation has a significant impact on our ultimate claim payments. For example, if the rate of medical claim cost inflation increases by 1% above the inflation rate that is implicitly included in the loss reserves at December 31, 2013, we estimate that future medical costs over the lifetime of current claims would increase by

approximately \$95 million on a net-of-reinsurance basis.

The range of estimates of unpaid losses and LAE produced by our actuarial reviews of medical cost inflation data provide some indication of the potential variability of future losses and LAE payments; however, the full range of potential variation is difficult to estimate because our insurance subsidiaries do not have a lengthy operating history in many of the states in which we now operate.

Our reserve estimates reflect expected increases in the costs of contested claims, but do not assume any losses resulting from significant new legal liability theories. Our reserve estimates also assume that there will not be significant future changes in the regulatory and legislative environment. In the event of significant new legal liability theories or new regulation or legislation, we will attempt to quantify its impact on our business.

If the actual unpaid losses and LAE were at the high or the low end of the actuarial range, the impact on our financial results would have been as follows:

	December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
Increase (decrease) in reserves	(in thousands)		
At low end of range	\$(121,431 )	\$(118,281 )	\$(104,324 )
At high end of range	227,658	194,411	140,448
Increase (decrease) in equity and net income, net of income tax effect			
At low end of range	\$78,930	\$76,883	\$67,811
At high end of range	(147,978 )	(126,367 )	(91,291 )

Actual losses are affected by a more complex combination of forces and dynamics than any one model or actuarial methodology can represent, and each methodology is an approximation of these complex forces and dynamics. None of the methods are designed or intended to produce an indication that is systematically higher or lower than the other methods. At any given evaluation date, some of the actuarial projection methods produce indications outside the Consulting Actuary's selected range. Accordingly, we believe that the range of potential outcomes is considerably wider than the actuarially estimated range of the most likely outcomes. We have no basis for anticipating whether actual future payments of losses and LAE may be either greater than or less than the reserve for unpaid losses and LAE currently on our balance sheet.

Additionally, any adjustment to the estimated ceded reserves 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, so that the Deferred Gain reflects the balance that would have existed had the revised reserves been recognized at the inception of the LPT Agreement. The table below provides the actuarial range of estimated liabilities for gross unpaid losses and LAE under the LPT Agreement and our carried reserves.

	As of December 31, 2013 (in thousands)
Low end of actuarial range	\$539,565
LPT carried reserves	612,073
High end of actuarial range	641,838

If the actual gross unpaid losses and LAE under the LPT Agreement were at the high or the low end of the actuarial range, the impact on our financial results, excluding the impact of the contingent profit commission, would have been as follows:

	December 31, 2013 (in thousands)
Increase (decrease) in reserves	
At low end of range	\$(72,508 )
At high end of range	29,765
Increase (decrease) in equity and net income resulting from Deferred Gain	
At low end of range	\$47,130
At high end of range	(19,347 )
Reinsurance Recoverables	

Reinsurance recoverables represent: (a) amounts currently due from reinsurers on paid losses and LAE; (b) amounts recoverable from reinsurers on case basis estimates of reported losses; and (c) amounts recoverable from reinsurers on actuarial estimates of IBNR for losses and LAE. These recoverables are based on our current estimates of the underlying losses and LAE, and are reported on our consolidated balance sheets separately as assets, as reinsurance does not relieve us of our legal liability to policyholders. We bear credit risk with respect to the reinsurers, which can be significant considering that some of the unpaid losses and LAE remain outstanding for an extended period of time. Reinsurers may refuse or fail to pay losses that we cede to them, or they might delay payment. We are required to pay

losses even if a reinsurer refuses or fails to meet its obligations under the applicable reinsurance agreement. We periodically monitor the financial condition and rating agency ratings of our reinsurers. No material amounts due from reinsurers have been written-off as uncollectible since our inception in 2000, and we believe that amounts currently reflected in our consolidated financial statements will similarly not require any material prospective adjustment. 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 estimated remaining liabilities subject to

42

---

the LPT Agreement were \$612.1 million as of December 31, 2013. Losses and LAE paid with respect to the LPT Agreement totaled \$637.9 million at December 31, 2013. We account for the LPT Agreement as retroactive reinsurance. Entry into the LPT Agreement resulted in a deferred reinsurance gain that was recorded on our consolidated balance sheet as a liability. The Deferred Gain is being amortized using the recovery method, whereby the amortization is determined by the proportion of actual reinsurance recoveries to total estimated recoveries through the life of the LPT Agreement, and the amortization is reflected in losses and LAE. Changes in estimates of the reserves ceded under the LPT Agreement may significantly impact the Deferred Gain on our consolidated balance sheet and losses and LAE in our consolidated statement of comprehensive income.

Additionally, we are entitled to receive a contingent commission under the LPT Agreement. The contingent profit is an amount based on the favorable difference between actual paid losses and LAE and expected paid losses and LAE as established in the LPT Agreement. The calculation of actual amounts paid versus expected amounts is determined every five years beginning June 30, 2004 for the first twenty-five years of the agreement. We are paid 30% of the favorable difference between the actual and expected losses and LAE paid at each calculation point. Each quarter, management records its best estimate of the estimated ultimate contingent profit commission through June 30, 2024, which is impacted by estimates for ceded loss and LAE reserves. The related Deferred reinsurance gain–LPT Agreement is amortized using the recovery method, whereby the amortization is determined by the proportion of actual reinsurance recoveries to total estimated recoveries over the life of the contingent profit commission, or through June 30, 2024, and is recorded in losses and LAE incurred in the accompanying consolidated statements of comprehensive income. Changes in estimates of the reserves ceded under the LPT Agreement may significantly impact the contingent commission receivable–LPT Agreement and the Deferred Gain on our consolidated balance sheet and losses and LAE in our consolidated statement of comprehensive income.

#### Recognition of Premium Revenue

Premium revenue is recognized over the period of the contract in proportion to the amount of insurance protection provided. At the end of the policy term, payroll-based premium audits are performed on substantially all policyholder accounts to determine net premiums earned for the policy year. Earned but unbilled premiums include estimated future audit premiums based on our historical experience. These estimates are subject to changes in policyholders' payrolls, economic conditions, and seasonality, and are continually reviewed and adjusted as experience develops or new information becomes known. Any such adjustments are included in current operations; however, they are partially offset by the resulting changes in losses and LAE, commission expenses, and premium taxes. Although considerable variability is inherent in such estimates, we believe that amounts currently reflected in our consolidated financial statements will similarly not require any material prospective adjustment.

#### Income Taxes

Our accounting for income taxes considers the current and deferred tax consequences of all transactions that have been recognized in our consolidated financial statements using the provisions of enacted tax laws. Deferred tax assets and liabilities are determined based on differences between the financial reporting and tax bases of assets and liabilities and are measured using the enacted tax rates and laws that will be in effect when the differences are expected to reverse. The effect on deferred tax assets and liabilities resulting from a tax rate change affects our net income or loss in the period that includes the enactment date of the tax rate change. Our income tax returns are subject to audit by the Internal Revenue Service and various state tax authorities. Significant disputes may arise with these tax authorities involving issues of the timing and amount of deductions and allocations of income among various tax jurisdictions because of differing interpretations of tax laws and regulations. We periodically evaluate our exposures associated with tax filing positions. Although we believe our positions comply with applicable laws, we record liabilities based upon estimates of the ultimate outcomes of these matters.

In assessing whether our deferred tax assets will be realized, we consider whether it is more likely than not that we will generate future taxable income during the periods in which those temporary differences become deductible. We consider the scheduled reversal of deferred tax liabilities, tax planning strategies, and projected future taxable income in making this assessment. If necessary, we establish a valuation allowance to reduce the deferred tax assets to the amounts that are more likely than not to be realized.

#### Valuation of Investments

Our investments in fixed maturity and equity securities are classified as available-for-sale and are reported at fair value with unrealized gains and losses excluded from earnings and reported as a separate component of equity, net of deferred taxes, in accumulated other comprehensive income. Realized gains and losses on sales of investments are recognized in operations on a specific-identification basis.

Fair values of our available-for-sale fixed maturity and equity securities are based on quoted market prices, where available. These fair values are obtained primarily from third party pricing services, which generally use Level 1 or Level 2 inputs in accordance with FASB guidance. The Company obtains a quoted price for each security from third party pricing services, which are derived through recently reported trades for identical or similar securities. For securities not actively traded, the third party pricing services may use quoted market prices of similar instruments or discounted cash flow analyses, incorporating inputs that are currently

observable in the markets for similar securities. Inputs that are often used in the valuation methodologies include, but are not limited to, broker quotes, benchmark yields, credit spreads, default rates, and prepayment speeds. The Company also performs quarterly analysis on the prices received from third parties to determine whether the prices are reasonable estimates of fair value, including confirming the fair values of these securities through observable market prices using an alternative pricing source. If differences are noted in this review, the Company may obtain additional information from other pricing services to validate the quoted price. (See Note 6 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements.)

**Impairment of Investment Securities.** When, in the opinion of management, a decline in the fair value of an equity security below its cost is considered to be “other-than-temporary,” the equity security's cost is written down to its fair value at the time the other-than-temporary decline is identified. The determination of an other-than-temporary decline for debt securities includes, in addition to other relevant factors, a presumption that if the fair value is below cost by a significant amount for a period of time, a bifurcation of the write-down may be necessary. If management has the intent to sell the debt security or more likely than not will be required to sell the debt security before its anticipated recovery, the investment is written down to its fair value and the entire impairment is recorded as a realized loss due to credit in the accompanying consolidated statements of comprehensive income. If management does not have the intent to sell or will not be required to sell the debt security but does not expect to recover the amortized cost basis of the debt security, the amount of the other-than-temporary impairment is bifurcated between credit loss and other loss and recorded as a component of realized gains and losses and in other comprehensive income, respectively, in the consolidated statements of comprehensive income. The amount of any write-down is determined by the difference between the cost or amortized cost of the debt security and its fair value at the time the other-than-temporary decline is identified.

#### Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets

We prepare a valuation analysis for goodwill and other intangible assets, whereby we identify whether events have occurred that may impact the carrying value of these assets and make assumptions regarding future events, such as cash flows and profitability. Differences between the assumptions used to prepare these valuations and actual results could materially impact the carrying amount of these assets and our operating results.

#### New Accounting Standards

Prior to December 31, 2013, accounting guidance was issued that we either implemented during 2013 or will implement in future periods. None of this guidance had or is expected to have a material effect on our consolidated financial condition or results of operations. (See Note 5 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements.)

#### Item 7A. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk

Market risk is 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 credit risk, interest rate risk, and equity price risk.

##### Credit Risk

Our fixed maturity securities portfolio is exposed to credit risk, which we attempt to manage through issuer and industry diversification. Our investment guidelines include limitations on the minimum rating of fixed maturity securities in our investment portfolio, as well as restrictions on investments in fixed maturity securities of a single issuer.

We also bear credit risk with respect to the reinsurers, which can be significant considering that some of the unpaid losses and LAE remain outstanding for an extended period of time. We are required to pay losses even if a reinsurer refuses or fails to meet its obligations under the applicable reinsurance agreement. We continually monitor the financial condition and rating agency ratings of our reinsurers. Additionally, we bear credit risk with respect to premiums receivable, which is generally diversified due to the large number of entities composing the Company's policyholder base and their dispersion across many different industries.

##### Interest Rate Risk

##### Investments

The fair value of our fixed maturity securities portfolio is exposed to interest rate risk, the risk of loss in fair value resulting from changes in prevailing interest rates, which we strive to limit by managing duration. Our investments (excluding cash and cash equivalents) had a duration of 4.2 at December 31, 2013. 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. We continually monitor the impact of interest rate changes on our liquidity obligations.

Sensitivity Analysis

The fair values or cash flows of market sensitive instruments are subject to potential losses in future earnings resulting from changes in interest rates and other market rates or prices. Our sensitivity analysis model uses a hypothetical change in market rates that reflects what we believe are reasonably possible near-term changes in those rates (covering a period of time going forward up to one year from the date of the consolidated financial statements). Actual results may differ from the hypothetical change in

market rates assumed in this disclosure. This sensitivity analysis does not reflect the results of any action that we may take to mitigate such hypothetical losses in fair value.

We use fair values to measure our potential loss in this model, which includes fixed maturity securities and short-term investments. For invested assets, we use modified duration modeling to calculate changes in fair values. Durations on invested assets are adjusted for call, put, and interest rate reset features. Invested asset portfolio durations are calculated on a market value weighted basis, excluding accrued investment income, using holdings as of December 31, 2013. The estimated changes in fair values on our fixed maturity securities including short-term investments, valued at \$2.2 billion as of December 31, 2013, based on specific changes in interest rates are as follows:

Changes in Interest Rates	Estimated Pre-tax Increase (Decrease) in Fair Value (in thousands, except percentages)	
300 basis point rise	\$(241,688	) (11.1 )%
200 basis point rise	(167,601	) (7.7 )
100 basis point rise	(86,878	) (4.0 )
50 basis point decline	43,259	2.0
100 basis point decline	82,557	3.8

The most significant assessment of the effects of hypothetical changes in interest rates on investment income would be based on FASB guidance related to "Accounting for Nonrefundable Fees and Costs Associated with Originating or Acquiring Loans and Initial Direct Costs of Leases," which requires amortization adjustments for mortgage-backed securities. The rates at which the mortgages underlying mortgage-backed securities are prepaid, and therefore the average life of mortgage-backed securities, can vary depending on changes in interest rates (for example, mortgages are prepaid faster and the average life of mortgage-backed securities falls when interest rates decline). Adjustments for changes in amortization are based on revised average life assumptions and would have an impact on investment income if a significant portion of our residential mortgage-backed securities were purchased at significant discounts or premiums to par value. As of December 31, 2013, the par value of our residential mortgage-backed securities holdings was \$249.7 million, and the amortized cost was 102.2% of par value. Since a majority of our mortgage-backed securities were purchased at a premium or discount that is significant as a percentage of par, an adjustment could have a significant effect on investment income. The residential mortgage-backed securities portion of the portfolio totaled 11.0% of total investments as of December 31, 2013. Agency-backed residential mortgage pass-throughs totaled \$256.9 million, or 99.4%, of the residential mortgage-backed securities portion of the portfolio as of December 31, 2013.

#### Equity Price Risk

Equity price risk is the risk that we may incur losses in the fair value of the equity securities we hold in our available-for-sale investment portfolio. Adverse changes in the market prices of the equity securities we hold in our investment portfolio would result in decreases in the fair value of our total assets. 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.

The table below shows the sensitivity of our equity securities to price changes as of December 31, 2013:

	Cost	Fair Value	10% Fair Value Decrease	Pre-tax Impact on Total Equity Securities	10% Fair Value Increase	Pre-tax Impact on Total Equity Securities
	(in thousands)					
Total domestic equities	\$89,689	\$162,312	\$146,081	\$(16,231 )	\$178,543	\$16,231

#### Effects of Inflation

Inflation could impact our financial statements and results of operations. Our estimates for losses and LAE include assumptions about the timing of closure and future payment of claims and claims handling expenses, such as medical treatments and litigation costs. To the extent inflation causes these costs to increase above established reserves, we will be required to increase those reserves for losses and LAE, reducing our earnings in the period in which the

deficiency is identified. We consider inflation in the reserving process by reviewing cost trends and our historical reserving results. We also consider an estimate of increased costs in determining the adequacy of our rates, particularly as it relates to medical and hospital rates where historical inflation rates have exceeded general inflation rates.

Fluctuations in rates of inflation also influence interest rates, which in turn impact the market value of our investment portfolio and yields on new investments. Operating expenses, including payrolls, are also impacted to a certain degree by inflation.

45

---

Item 8. Financial Statements and Supplementary Data

	Page
Management's Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting	<u>47</u>
Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm on Internal Control over Financial Reporting	<u>48</u>
Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm	<u>49</u>
Consolidated Balance Sheets as of December 31, 2013 and 2012	<u>50</u>
Consolidated Statements of Income and Comprehensive Income for each of the three years ended December 31, 2013	<u>51</u>
Consolidated Statements of Stockholders' Equity for each of the three years ended December 31, 2013	<u>52</u>
Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows for each of the three years ended December 31, 2013	<u>53</u>
Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements	<u>54</u>

The following financial statement schedules are filed in Item 15 of Part IV of this report:

Financial Statement Schedules:

Schedule II. Condensed Financial Information of Registrant	<u>79</u>
Schedule VI. Supplemental Information Concerning Property-Casualty Insurance Operations	<u>84</u>

Pursuant to Rule 7-05 of Regulation S-X, Schedules I, III, IV and V have been omitted as the information to be set forth therein is included in the notes to the audited consolidated financial statements.

#### MANAGEMENT'S REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING

Management of Employers Holdings, Inc. and its Subsidiaries (collectively, the Company) is responsible for establishing and maintaining adequate internal control over financial reporting and for the assessment of the effectiveness of internal control over financial reporting. As defined by the Securities and Exchange Commission, internal control over financial reporting is a process designed by, or under the supervision of, the Company's principal executive officer and principal financial officer, and effected by the Company's Board of Directors, management and other personnel, to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP).

The Company's internal control over financial reporting includes policies and procedures that: (a) pertain to the maintenance of records that, in reasonable detail, accurately and fairly reflect the transactions and dispositions of the Company's assets; (b) provide reasonable assurance that transactions are recorded as necessary to permit preparation of financial statements in accordance with GAAP, and that receipts and expenditures of the Company are being made only in accordance with authorizations of its management and Board of Directors; and (c) provide reasonable assurance regarding prevention or timely detection of unauthorized acquisition, use or disposition of the Company's assets that could have a material effect on the financial statements.

Because of its inherent limitations, internal control over financial reporting may not prevent or detect all misstatements. Projections of any evaluation of effectiveness to future periods are subject to the risk that controls may become inadequate because of changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with the policies or procedures may deteriorate.

Management conducted an assessment of the effectiveness of the Company's internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2013 based on criteria established in Internal Control–Integrated Framework issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission 1992 framework (COSO Framework).

Based on this assessment, management did not identify any material weaknesses in the internal control over financial reporting and management has concluded that the Company's internal control over financial reporting was effective as of December 31, 2013.

The Company's independent registered public accounting firm, Ernst & Young LLP, has independently assessed the effectiveness of the Company's internal control over financial reporting. A copy of their report is included in Item 8 of this report.

February 20, 2014

REPORT OF INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING

The Board of Directors and Stockholders  
Employers Holdings, Inc. and Subsidiaries

We have audited Employers Holdings, Inc. and Subsidiaries' internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2013, based on criteria established in Internal Control-Integrated Framework issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (1992 framework) (the COSO criteria). Employers Holdings, Inc. and Subsidiaries' management is responsible for maintaining effective internal control over financial reporting, and for its assessment of the effectiveness of internal control over financial reporting included in the accompanying Management's Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the company's internal control over financial reporting based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States). Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether effective internal control over financial reporting was maintained in all material respects. Our audit included obtaining an understanding of internal control over financial reporting, assessing the risk that a material weakness exists, testing and evaluating the design and operating effectiveness of internal control based on the assessed risk, and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

A company's internal control over financial reporting is a process designed to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. A company's internal control over financial reporting includes those policies and procedures that (1) pertain to the maintenance of records that, in reasonable detail, accurately and fairly reflect the transactions and dispositions of the assets of the company; (2) provide reasonable assurance that transactions are recorded as necessary to permit preparation of financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, and that receipts and expenditures of the company are being made only in accordance with authorizations of management and directors of the company; and (3) provide reasonable assurance regarding prevention or timely detection of unauthorized acquisition, use or disposition of the company's assets that could have a material effect on the financial statements.

Because of its inherent limitations, internal control over financial reporting may not prevent or detect misstatements. Also, projections of any evaluation of effectiveness to future periods are subject to the risk that controls may become inadequate because of changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with the policies or procedures may deteriorate.

In our opinion, Employers Holdings, Inc. and Subsidiaries maintained, in all material respects, effective internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2013, based on the COSO criteria.

We also have audited, in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States), the consolidated balance sheets of Employers Holdings, Inc. and Subsidiaries as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, and the related consolidated statements of comprehensive income, stockholders' equity and cash flows for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2013 and our report dated February 20, 2014 expressed an unqualified opinion thereon.

/s/ Ernst & Young LLP  
Los Angeles, California  
February 20, 2014



REPORT OF INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM

The Board of Directors and Stockholders  
Employers Holdings, Inc. and Subsidiaries

We have audited the accompanying consolidated balance sheets of Employers Holdings, Inc. and Subsidiaries as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, and the related consolidated statements of comprehensive income, stockholders' equity and cash flows for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2013. Our audits also included the financial statement schedules listed in the Index at Item 15. These financial statements and schedules are the responsibility of the Company's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements and schedules based on our audits.

We conducted our audits in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States). Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the consolidated financial position of Employers Holdings, Inc. and Subsidiaries at December 31, 2013 and 2012, and the consolidated results of their operations and their cash flows for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2013, in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. Also, in our opinion, the related financial statement schedules, when considered in relation to the basic financial statements taken as a whole, present fairly in all material respects the information set forth therein.

We also have audited, in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States), Employers Holdings, Inc. and Subsidiaries' internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2013, based on criteria established in Internal Control-Integrated Framework issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (1992 framework) and our report dated February 20, 2014 expressed an unqualified opinion thereon.

/s/ Ernst & Young LLP  
Los Angeles, California  
February 20, 2014

## Employers Holdings, Inc. and Subsidiaries

## Consolidated Balance Sheets

	As of December 31,	
	2013	2012
	(in thousands, except share data)	
Assets		
Available for sale:		
Fixed maturity securities at fair value (amortized cost \$2,116,064 at December 31, 2013 and \$1,869,142 at December 31, 2012)	\$2,182,546	\$2,024,428
Equity securities at fair value (cost \$89,689 at December 31, 2013 and \$81,067 at December 31, 2012)	162,312	125,086
Total investments	2,344,858	2,149,514
Cash and cash equivalents	34,503	140,661
Restricted cash and cash equivalents	6,564	5,353
Accrued investment income	20,255	19,356
Premiums receivable, less bad debt allowance of \$7,064 at December 31, 2013 and \$5,957 at December 31, 2012	279,080	223,011
Reinsurance recoverable for:		
Paid losses	8,412	9,467
Unpaid losses, including bad debt allowance of \$389 at December 31, 2013	742,666	805,386
Deferred policy acquisition costs	43,532	38,852
Deferred income taxes, net	58,062	26,231
Property and equipment, net	16,616	14,680
Intangible assets, net	9,685	10,558
Goodwill	36,192	36,192
Contingent commission receivable—LPT Agreement	25,104	19,141
Other assets	17,920	12,937
Total assets	\$3,643,449	\$3,511,339
Liabilities and stockholders' equity		
Claims and policy liabilities:		
Unpaid losses and loss adjustment expenses	\$2,330,491	\$2,231,540
Unearned premiums	303,967	265,149
Total claims and policy liabilities	2,634,458	2,496,689
Commissions and premium taxes payable	45,314	40,825
Accounts payable and accrued expenses	18,711	19,522
Deferred reinsurance gain—LPT Agreement	249,072	281,043
Notes payable	102,000	112,000
Other liabilities	25,191	21,879
Total liabilities	\$3,074,746	\$2,971,958
Commitments and contingencies (Note 13)		
Stockholders' equity:		
Common stock, \$0.01 par value; 150,000,000 shares authorized; 54,672,904 and 54,144,453 shares issued and 31,299,930 and 30,771,479 shares outstanding at December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively	\$547	\$542
Preferred stock, \$0.01 par value; 25,000,000 shares authorized; none issued	—	—

Explanation of Responses:

Edgar Filing: LaNeve Stephen - Form 4

Additional paid-in capital	338,090	325,990
Retained earnings	502,198	445,850
Accumulated other comprehensive income, net	90,418	129,549
Treasury stock, at cost (23,372,974 shares at December 31, 2013 and 2012)	(362,550	) (362,550 )
Total stockholders' equity	568,703	539,381
Total liabilities and stockholders' equity	\$3,643,449	\$3,511,339
See accompanying notes.		

50

---

## Employers Holdings, Inc. and Subsidiaries

## Consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Income

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
Revenues	(in thousands, except per share data)		
Net premiums earned	\$642,349	\$501,464	\$363,424
Net investment income	70,764	72,363	80,117
Realized gains on investments, net	9,529	5,048	20,161
Other income	939	307	452
Total revenues	723,581	579,182	464,154
Expenses			
Losses and loss adjustment expenses	463,579	287,910	262,511
Commission expense	78,258	65,580	47,344
Underwriting and other operating expenses	125,324	124,644	104,140
Interest expense	3,246	3,504	3,642
Total expenses	670,407	481,638	417,637
Net income before income taxes	53,174	97,544	46,517
Income tax benefit	(10,650)	) (9,347	) (2,106
Net income	\$63,824	\$106,891	\$48,623
Comprehensive income			
Unrealized (losses) gains during the period (net of tax (benefit) expense of \$(17,734), \$8,675, and \$24,602 for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively)	\$(32,937)	) \$16,111	\$45,691
Reclassification adjustment for realized gains in net income (net of taxes of \$3,335, \$1,767, and \$7,056 for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively)	(6,194)	) (3,281	) (13,105
Other comprehensive (loss) income, net of tax	(39,131)	) 12,830	32,586
Total comprehensive income	\$24,693	\$119,721	\$81,209
Earnings per common share (Note 19):			
Basic	\$2.05	\$3.40	\$1.30
Diluted	\$2.00	\$3.37	\$1.30
Cash dividends declared per common share	\$0.24	\$0.24	\$0.24
Realized gains on investments, net			
Net realized gains on investments before credit related impairments on fixed maturity and equity securities	\$9,597	\$5,700	\$20,255
Other than temporary impairment, credit losses recognized in earnings	(68)	) (652	) (94
Realized gains on investments, net	\$9,529	\$5,048	\$20,161

See accompanying notes.



## Employers Holdings, Inc. and Subsidiaries

## Consolidated Statements of Stockholders' Equity

	Common Stock		Additional Paid In Capital	Retained Earnings	Accumulated Other Comprehensive Income, Net	Treasury Stock at Cost	Total Stockholders' Equity
	Shares	Amount					
	(in thousands, except share data)						
Balance, January 1, 2011	53,779,118	\$ 538	\$ 314,212	\$ 306,828	\$ 84,133	\$(228,108 )	\$ 477,603
Stock-based compensation (Note 15)	—	—	3,742	—	—	—	3,742
Stock options exercised	92,646	1	1,530	—	—	—	1,531
Vesting of restricted stock units, net of shares withheld to satisfy minimum tax withholding (Note 15)	76,678	1	(513 )	—	—	—	(512 )
Acquisition of treasury stock (Note 14)	—	—	—	—	—	(92,647 )	(92,647 )
Dividend to common stockholders	—	—	18	(8,961 )	—	—	(8,943 )
Net income for the year	—	—	—	48,623	—	—	48,623
Change in net unrealized gains on investments, net of taxes of \$17,546	—	—	—	—	32,586	—	32,586
Balance, December 31, 2011	53,948,442	\$ 540	\$ 318,989	\$ 346,490	\$ 116,719	\$(320,755 )	\$ 461,983
Balance, January 1, 2012	53,948,442	\$ 540	\$ 318,989	\$ 346,490	\$ 116,719	\$(320,755 )	\$ 461,983
Stock-based compensation (Note 15)	—	—	6,141	—	—	—	6,141
Stock options exercised	101,261	1	1,430	—	—	—	1,431
Vesting of restricted stock units, net of shares withheld to satisfy minimum tax withholding (Note 15)	94,750	1	(593 )	—	—	—	(592 )
	—	—	—	—	—	(41,795 )	(41,795 )

Explanation of Responses:

Edgar Filing: LaNeve Stephen - Form 4

Acquisition of treasury stock (Note 14)							
Dividend to common stockholders	—	—	23	(7,531	)	—	(7,508
Net income for the year		—	—	106,891	—	—	106,891
Change in net unrealized gains on investments, net of taxes of \$6,908		—	—	—	12,830	—	12,830
Balance, December 31, 2012	54,144,453	\$ 542	\$ 325,990	\$ 445,850	\$ 129,549	\$(362,550)	\$ 539,381
Balance, January 1, 2013	54,144,453	\$ 542	\$ 325,990	\$ 445,850	\$ 129,549	\$(362,550)	\$ 539,381
Stock-based compensation (Note 15)	—	—	5,622	—	—	—	5,622
Stock options exercised	411,295	4	7,352	—	—	—	7,356
Vesting of restricted stock units, net of shares withheld to satisfy minimum tax withholding (Note 15)	117,156	1	(895	)	—	—	(894
Dividend to common stockholders	—	—	21	(7,476	)	—	(7,455
Net income for the year		—	—	63,824	—	—	63,824
Change in net unrealized gains on investments, net of taxes of \$(21,069)		—	—	—	(39,131	)	(39,131
Balance, December 31, 2013	54,672,904	\$ 547	\$ 338,090	\$ 502,198	\$ 90,418	\$(362,550)	\$ 568,703

See accompanying notes.

Employers Holdings, Inc. and Subsidiaries  
Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
	(in thousands)		
Operating activities			
Net income	\$63,824	\$106,891	\$48,623
Adjustments to reconcile net income to net cash provided by operating activities:			
Depreciation and amortization	6,080	5,601	6,388
Stock-based compensation	5,622	6,141	3,742
Amortization of premium on investments, net	8,969	7,019	7,242
Deferred income tax benefit	(10,761 )	(10,999 )	(1,608 )
Realized gains on investments, net	(9,529 )	(5,048 )	(20,161 )
Other	241	134	(3,043 )
Change in operating assets and liabilities:			
Premiums receivable	(57,175 )	(62,979 )	(48,399 )
Reinsurance recoverable on paid and unpaid losses	63,775	136,716	18,889
Federal income taxes recoverable	(3,663 )	100	2,055
Unpaid losses and loss adjustment expenses	98,951	(40,823 )	(7,366 )
Unearned premiums	38,818	70,216	45,448
Accounts payable, accrued expenses and other liabilities	(1,080 )	2,132	(5,645 )
Deferred reinsurance gain–LPT Agreement	(31,971 )	(84,920 )	(17,436 )
Contingent commission receivable–LPT Agreement	(5,963 )	(15,014 )	(1,863 )
Other	(2,413 )	16,082	15,518
Net cash provided by operating activities	163,725	131,249	42,384
Investing activities			
Purchase of fixed maturity securities	(514,210 )	(444,001 )	(217,630 )
Purchase of equity securities	(30,499 )	(30,979 )	(21,080 )
Proceeds from sale of fixed maturity securities	52,471	50,465	235,646
Proceeds from sale of equity securities	30,652	16,147	6,246
Proceeds from maturities and redemptions of investments	206,843	227,888	190,449
Proceeds from sale of fixed assets	780	226	396
Capital expenditures and other	(3,716 )	(5,116 )	(4,687 )
Restricted cash and cash equivalents (used in) provided by investing activities	(1,211 )	946	10,650
Net cash (used in) provided by investing activities	(258,890 )	(184,424 )	199,990
Financing activities			
Acquisition of treasury stock	—	(41,795 )	(91,975 )
Cash transactions related to stock-based compensation	6,462	839	1,019
Dividends paid to stockholders	(7,455 )	(7,508 )	(8,943 )
Payments on notes payable	(10,000 )	(10,000 )	(10,000 )
Net cash used in financing activities	(10,993 )	(58,464 )	(109,899 )
Net (decrease) increase in cash and cash equivalents	(106,158 )	(111,639 )	132,475
Cash and cash equivalents at the beginning of the period	140,661	252,300	119,825
Cash and cash equivalents at the end of the period	\$34,503	\$140,661	\$252,300
Cash paid (received) for income taxes	\$3,850	\$1,819	\$(2,697 )
Cash paid for interest	\$3,052	\$3,375	\$3,561
Schedule of non-cash transactions			
Financed property and equipment purchases	\$3,582	\$3,106	\$—
See accompanying notes.			



Employers Holdings, Inc. and Subsidiaries  
Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements  
December 31, 2013

1. Basis of Presentation and Summary of Operations

Nature of Operations and Organization

Employers Holdings, Inc. (EHI) is a Nevada holding company. Through its wholly owned insurance subsidiaries, Employers Insurance Company of Nevada (EICN), Employers Compensation Insurance Company (ECIC), Employers Preferred Insurance Company (EPIC), and Employers Assurance Company (EAC), EHI is engaged in the commercial property and casualty insurance industry, specializing in workers' compensation products and services. Unless otherwise indicated, all references to the "Company" refer to EHI, together with its subsidiaries.

Basis of Presentation

The accompanying consolidated financial statements have been prepared in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP). All intercompany transactions and balances have been eliminated in consolidation.

The Company considers an operating segment to be any component of its business whose operating results are regularly reviewed by the Company's chief operating decision maker to make decisions about resources to be allocated to the segment and assess its performance based on discrete financial information. Currently, the Company has one operating segment, workers' compensation insurance and related services.

Use of Estimates

The preparation of the consolidated financial statements in conformity with GAAP requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the consolidated financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reporting period. As a result, actual results could differ from these estimates. The most significant areas that require management judgment are the estimate of unpaid losses and loss adjustment expenses (LAE), evaluation of reinsurance recoverables, recognition of premium revenue, deferred income taxes, investments, and the valuation of goodwill and intangible assets.

Reclassifications

Certain prior period information has been reclassified to conform to the current period presentation.

2. Changes in Estimates

In 2013, the Company increased its estimate of contingent commission receivable – LPT Agreement as a result of the determination in the fourth quarter of 2013 that an adjustment was necessary to reflect observed favorable paid loss trends. This change in estimate resulted in a \$4.3 million cumulative adjustment to the deferred reinsurance gain–LPT Agreement (Deferred Gain), which was also recognized in losses and LAE incurred in the consolidated statement of comprehensive income, so 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 Contingent Commission Adjustment). This change in estimate increased net income by \$4.3 million, or \$0.14 per basic and diluted share, respectively.

In 2013, the Company reduced its estimated reserves ceded under the Loss Portfolio Transfer Agreement (LPT Agreement) by \$27.5 million. This change in estimate resulted in a \$19.0 million cumulative adjustment to the Deferred Gain, which was also recognized in losses and LAE incurred in the consolidated statement of comprehensive income, so 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). This change in estimate was the result of the determination that an adjustment was necessary to reflect observed favorable paid loss trends. This change in estimate increased net income by \$19.0 million, or \$0.61 and \$0.59 per basic and diluted share, respectively.

In 2013, the Company reallocated \$27.2 million in reserves from non-taxable periods prior to January 1, 2000 to taxable years, which reduced our effective tax rate by 13.9 percentage points for the year ended December 31, 2013. This change in estimate was the result of the determination in the third quarter of 2013 that a reallocation of reserves among accident years was appropriate to address a continuation of observed loss trends. The income tax impact of this change in estimate increased net income by \$7.4 million, or \$0.24 and \$0.23 per basic and diluted share, respectively.

In 2012, the Company reduced its estimated reserves ceded under the LPT Agreement by \$100.0 million. This change in estimate resulted in a \$73.3 million LPT Reserve Adjustment. This change in estimate was the result of the

determination in the fourth

54

---

quarter of 2012 that an adjustment was necessary to reflect observed favorable paid loss trends. This change in estimate increased net income by \$73.3 million, or \$2.33 and \$2.31 per basic and diluted share, respectively. In 2012, the Company increased its estimate of contingent commission receivable – LPT Agreement as a result of the determination in the fourth quarter of 2012 that an adjustment was necessary to reflect observed favorable paid loss trends. This change in estimate resulted in a \$8.6 million LPT Contingent Commission Adjustment. This change in estimate also resulted in an additional \$0.6 million bonus accrual that increased the income tax benefit by \$0.2 million during the year ended December 31, 2012. This change in estimate increased net income by \$8.2 million, or \$0.26 per basic and diluted share.

In 2012, the Company changed the estimate of its guaranty fund assessment liability as a result of the application of new information related to historical payment trends and reflected this change in its financial statements. This change in estimate resulted in a \$2.9 million reduction of the accrued liability for guaranty fund assessments, offset by a \$0.7 million reduction in the corresponding premium tax asset and a \$0.8 million reduction in deferred acquisition costs (DAC) that reduced the Company's underwriting and other operating expense by a total of \$1.4 million and reduced the income tax benefit by \$0.2 million for the year ended December 31, 2012. This change in estimate increased net income by \$1.2 million, or \$0.04 per basic and diluted share, for the year ended December 31, 2012.

### 3. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

#### Cash and Cash Equivalents

The Company considers all highly liquid investments with an initial maturity of three months or less at the date of purchase to be cash equivalents.

#### Restricted Cash and Cash Equivalents

Restricted cash and cash equivalents is primarily related to funds held in trust to secure the Company's line of credit and for reinsurance. As of December 31, 2013 and 2012, the Company held \$28.2 million and \$30.8 million, respectively, in trust for reinsurance, of which \$3.5 million and \$2.5 million was classified as restricted cash and cash equivalents as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively.

#### Investments

The Company's investments in fixed maturity securities and equity securities are classified as available-for-sale and are reported at fair value with unrealized gains and losses excluded from earnings and reported as a separate component of equity, net of deferred taxes, in accumulated other comprehensive income.

Investment income consists primarily of interest and dividends. Interest is recognized on an accrual basis, and dividends are recorded as earned at the ex-dividend date. Interest income on mortgage-backed and asset-backed securities is determined using the effective-yield method based on estimated principal repayments. Mortgage-backed securities are adjusted for the effects of changes in prepayment assumptions on the related accretion of discount or amortization of premium of such securities using the retrospective method.

Realized capital gains and losses on investments are determined on a specific-identification basis.

When, in the opinion of management, a decline in the fair value of an equity security below its cost is considered to be "other-than-temporary," the equity security's cost is written down to its fair value at the time the other-than-temporary decline is identified. The determination of an other-than-temporary decline for debt securities includes, in addition to other relevant factors, a presumption that if the market value is below cost by a significant amount for a period of time, a bifurcation of the write-down may be necessary. If management has the intent to sell the debt security or more likely than not will be required to sell the debt security before its anticipated recovery, the investment is written down to its fair value and the entire impairment is recorded as a realized loss due to credit in the accompanying consolidated statements of comprehensive income. If management does not have the intent to sell or will not be required to sell the debt security but does not expect to recover the amortized cost basis of the debt security, the amount of the other-than-temporary impairment is bifurcated between credit loss and other loss and recorded as a component of realized gains and losses and to other comprehensive income, respectively, in the consolidated statements of comprehensive income. The amount of any write-down is determined by the difference between the cost or amortized cost of the debt security and its fair value at the time the other-than-temporary decline is identified (see Note 7).

#### Recognition of Revenue and Expense

#### Revenue Recognition

Premium revenue is recognized over the period of the contract in proportion to the amount of time insurance protection is provided. At the end of the policy term, payroll-based premium audits are performed on substantially all policyholder accounts to determine net premiums earned for the policy year. Earned but unbilled premiums include estimated future audit premiums based on the Company's historical experience. These estimates are subject to changes in policyholders' payrolls, economic conditions, and

55

---

seasonality, and are continually reviewed and adjusted as experience develops or new information becomes known. Any such adjustments are included in current operations; however, they are partially offset by the resulting changes in losses and LAE, commission expenses, and premium taxes. The Company's premiums receivable on the consolidated balance sheet included \$40.8 million and \$19.6 million of additional premiums expected to be received from policyholders for final audits at December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively.

The Company establishes a bad debt allowance on its premiums receivable through a charge included in underwriting and other operating expenses in the accompanying consolidated statements of comprehensive income. This bad debt allowance is determined based on estimates and assumptions to project future experience. After all collection efforts have been exhausted, the Company reduces the bad debt allowance for write-offs of premiums receivable that have been deemed uncollectible. The Company had write-offs, net of recoveries of amounts previously written off, of \$2.5 million, \$1.9 million, and \$2.2 million for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively.

#### Deferred Policy Acquisition Costs

Policy acquisition costs, consisting of commissions, premium taxes, and certain other underwriting costs that vary with, and are primarily related to, the successful production of new or renewal business are deferred and amortized as the related premiums are earned. Amortization of deferred policy acquisition costs for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, was \$96.9 million, \$85.9 million, and \$74.5 million, respectively.

A premium deficiency would exist if expected future losses and LAE, expected policyholder dividends, deferred policy acquisition costs, and expected policy maintenance costs, offset by anticipated investment income, exceed the related unearned premiums. A premium deficiency would reduce the value of deferred policy acquisition costs. If the deficiency exceeded the deferred policy acquisition costs, a separate liability would be accrued for the excess deficiency. There was no premium deficiency at December 31, 2013 or 2012.

#### Unpaid Loss and LAE Reserves

Loss and LAE reserves represent management's best estimate of the ultimate net cost of all reported and unreported losses incurred for the applicable periods. The estimated reserves for losses and LAE include the accumulation of estimates for all claims reported prior to the balance sheet date, estimates (based on projections of relevant historical data) of claims incurred but not reported, and estimates of expenses for investigating and adjusting all incurred and unadjusted claims. Amounts reported are necessarily subject to the impact of future changes in economic, regulatory and social conditions. Management believes that, subject to the inherent variability in any such estimate, the reserves are within a reasonable and acceptable range of adequacy. Estimates for claims reported prior to the balance sheet date are continually monitored and reviewed, and as settlements are made or reserves adjusted, the differences are reported in current operations. Salvage and subrogation recoveries are estimated based on a review of the level of historical salvage and subrogation recoveries.

#### Reinsurance

In the ordinary course of business and in accordance with general insurance industry practices, the Company purchases excess of loss reinsurance to protect the Company against the impact of large and/or catastrophic losses in its workers' compensation business. Additionally, the Company is a party to a 100% quota share retroactive reinsurance agreement (see Note 11). This reinsurance reduces the financial impact of such losses on current operations and the equity of the Company. Reinsurance makes the assuming reinsurer liable to the ceding company to the extent of the reinsurance coverage provided. It does not, however, discharge the Company from its liability to its policyholders in the event the reinsurer is unable or unwilling to meet its obligations under its reinsurance agreement with the Company.

Net premiums earned and losses and LAE incurred are stated in the accompanying consolidated statements of comprehensive income after deduction of amounts ceded to reinsurers. Balances due from reinsurers on unpaid losses, including an estimate of such recoverables related to reserves for incurred but not reported losses, are reported as assets and are included in reinsurance recoverables even though amounts due on unpaid losses and LAE are not recoverable from the reinsurer until such losses are paid. Recoverables from reinsurers on unpaid losses and LAE amounted to \$0.7 billion and \$0.8 billion at December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively.

Ceded losses and LAE are accounted for on a basis consistent with those used in accounting for the original policies issued and the terms of the relevant reinsurance agreement.

The 100% quota share retroactive reinsurance agreement was entered into in 1999 by the Nevada State Industrial Insurance System (the Fund) and assumed by EICN, which the Company refers to as the LPT Agreement (see Note 11). Loss expenses are deemed to be 7% of total losses paid and are paid to the Company as compensation for management of the claims under the LPT Agreement. The Company accounts for this transaction as retroactive reinsurance, whereby the initial deferred gain was recorded as a liability in the accompanying consolidated balance sheets as Deferred reinsurance gain—LPT Agreement. This gain is amortized using the recovery method, whereby the amortization is determined by the proportion of actual reinsurance recoveries to total estimated

recoveries through the life of the LPT Agreement, and is recorded in losses and LAE incurred in the accompanying consolidated statements of comprehensive income. Any adjustment to the estimated reserves ceded 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 reserves been recognized at the inception of the LPT Agreement.

Additionally, the Company is entitled to receive a contingent profit commission under the LPT Agreement. The contingent profit is equal to 30% of the favorable difference between actual paid losses and LAE and expected paid losses and LAE as established in the LPT Agreement based on losses paid through June 30, 2024. The contingent profit commission is paid every five years beginning June 30, 2004 for the first twenty-five years of the agreement. The Company is paid 30% of the favorable difference between the actual and expected losses and LAE paid at each calculation point. The Company could be required to return any previously received contingent profit commission, plus interest, in the event of unfavorable differences through June 30, 2024. The Company records its estimate of contingent profit commission in the accompanying consolidated balance sheets as Contingent commission receivable–LPT Agreement and a corresponding liability is recorded on the accompanying consolidated balance sheets in Deferred reinsurance gain–LPT Agreement. The Contingent commission receivable–LPT Agreement is reduced as amounts are received from participating reinsurers. The related Deferred reinsurance gain–LPT Agreement is amortized using the recovery method. The amortization of the contingent profit commission is determined by the proportion of actual reinsurance recoveries to total estimated recoveries over the life of the contingent profit commission (through June 30, 2024), and is recorded in losses and LAE incurred in the accompanying consolidated statements of comprehensive income. 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.

#### Property and Equipment

Property and equipment are stated at cost less accumulated depreciation (see Note 8). Expenditures for maintenance and repairs are charged against operations as incurred.

Electronic data processing equipment, software, furniture and equipment, and automobiles are depreciated using the straight-line method over three to seven years. Leasehold improvements are carried at cost less accumulated amortization. The Company amortizes leasehold improvements using the straight-line method over the lesser of the useful life of the asset or the remaining original lease term, excluding options or renewal periods. Leasehold improvements are generally amortized over three to five years.

#### Obligations Held Under Capital Leases

Leased property and equipment meeting capital lease criteria are capitalized at the lower of the present value of the related lease payments or the fair value of the leased asset at the inception of the lease. Amortization is calculated using the straight-line method based on the term of the lease and is included in the depreciation expense of property and equipment. See Note 13 for additional disclosures related to capital leases.

#### Income Taxes

The Company's accounting for income taxes considers the current and deferred tax consequences of all transactions that have been recognized in its consolidated financial statements using the provisions of enacted tax laws. Deferred tax assets and liabilities are determined based on differences between the financial reporting and tax bases of assets and liabilities and are measured using the enacted tax rates and laws that will be in effect when the differences are expected to reverse. The effect on deferred tax assets and liabilities resulting from a tax rate change affects net income or loss in the period that includes the enactment date of the tax rate change. The Company's income tax returns are subject to audit by the Internal Revenue Service and various state tax authorities. Significant disputes may arise with these tax authorities involving issues of the timing and amount of deductions and allocations of income among various tax jurisdictions because of differing interpretations of tax laws and regulations. The Company periodically evaluates exposures associated with tax filing positions. Although we believe our positions comply with applicable laws, liabilities are recorded based upon estimates of the ultimate outcomes of these matters.

In assessing whether deferred tax assets will be realized, the Company considers whether it is more likely than not that it will generate future taxable income during the periods in which those temporary differences become deductible. The Company considers the scheduled reversal of deferred tax liabilities, tax planning strategies, and projected future taxable income in making this assessment. If necessary, a valuation allowance is established to reduce the deferred tax assets to the amounts that are more likely than not to be realized.

**Credit Risk**

Financial instruments that potentially subject the Company to concentrations of credit risk are primarily cash and cash equivalents, investments, premiums receivable, and reinsurance recoverable balances.

Cash equivalents include investments in money market securities and securities backed by the U.S. government. Investments are diversified throughout many industries and geographic regions. The Company limits the amount of credit exposure with any one financial institution and believes that no significant concentration of credit risk exists with respect to cash and cash equivalents and investments.

At December 31, 2013 and 2012, the outstanding premiums receivable balance was generally diversified due to the large number of entities composing the Company's policyholder base and their dispersion across many different industries. The Company also has recoverables from its reinsurers. Reinsurance contracts do not relieve the Company of its obligations to claimants or policyholders. Failure of reinsurers to honor their obligations could result in losses to the Company. The Company evaluates the financial condition of its reinsurers to minimize its exposure to significant losses from reinsurer insolvencies. The Company obtains collateral to mitigate the risks related to reinsurance insolvencies. At December 31, 2013, \$5.8 million was collateralized by cash or letters of credit and an additional \$1.3 billion was in trust accounts for reinsurance related to the LPT Agreement.

#### Fair Value of Financial Instruments

Estimated fair value amounts have been determined using available market information and other appropriate valuation methodologies. Judgment is required in developing the estimates of fair value where quoted market prices are not available. Accordingly, these estimates are not necessarily indicative of the amounts that could be realized in a current market exchange. The use of different market assumptions or estimating methodologies may have an effect on the estimated fair value amounts.

The following methods and assumptions were used by the Company in estimating the fair value for financial instruments in the accompanying consolidated financial statements and in these notes for the years ended 2013 and 2012:

Cash and cash equivalents, premiums receivable, and accrued expenses and other liabilities. The carrying amounts for these financial instruments as reported in the accompanying consolidated balance sheets approximate their fair values. Investments. The estimated fair values for available-for-sale securities generally represent quoted market prices for securities traded in the public marketplace or estimated values for securities not traded in the public marketplace. Additional data with respect to fair values of the Company's investment securities is disclosed in Note 6.

#### Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets

The Company tests for impairment of goodwill and non-amortizable intangible assets in the fourth quarter of each year. At the end of each quarter, management considers the results of the previous analysis as well as any recent developments that may constitute triggering events requiring the impairment analysis of goodwill and other intangible assets to be updated. The Company has assessed the effects of current economic conditions on the Company's financial condition and results of operations and changes in the Company's stock price and determined that there were no impairments as of December 31, 2013 and 2012.

Intangible assets related to state licenses are not subject to amortization. Intangibles related to insurance relationships will be amortized in proportion to the expected period of benefit over the next five years.

The gross carrying value, accumulated amortization, and net carrying value for the Company's intangible assets, by major class, as of December 31, were as follows:

	2013			2012		
	Gross Carrying Value	Accumulated Amortization	Net Carrying Value	Gross Carrying Value	Accumulated Amortization	Net Carrying Value
	(in thousands)					
State licenses	\$7,700		\$7,700	\$7,700		\$7,700
Insurance relationships	9,400	\$(7,415)	) 1,985	9,400	\$(6,542)	) 2,858
Total	\$17,100	\$(7,415)	) \$9,685	\$17,100	\$(6,542)	) \$10,558

During the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, the Company recognized \$0.9 million, \$1.2 million, and \$1.6 million in amortization expenses, respectively. These amortization expenses are included in the accompanying consolidated statements of comprehensive income in underwriting and other operating expenses. Amortization expense is expected to be as follows:

Year	Amount (in thousands)
2014	\$651
2015	489
2016	371
2017	285
2018	189
Total	\$1,985

#### Stock-Based Compensation

The Company issues stock-based payments, which are recognized in the consolidated statements of comprehensive income based on their estimated fair values over the employees' service period (see Note 15).

#### 4. Deferred Policy Acquisition Costs

In October 2010, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) issued Accounting Standard Update (ASU) Number 2010-26, Accounting for Costs Associated with Acquiring or Renewing Insurance Contracts that became effective in 2012. This guidance changed the definition of acquisition costs which may be capitalized to specify costs that relate directly to the successful acquisition of new or renewal insurance contracts, including underwriting, policy issuance and processing, medical and inspection, and sales force contract selling. It also defines incremental direct costs that must be capitalized as costs that result directly from contract transactions that are essential to contract issuance, which would not have been incurred had the contract transaction not occurred. All other costs are expensed as incurred. Capitalized costs are amortized over the life of the contract.

The Company adopted this standard on a prospective basis on January 1, 2012. Under the new guidance, the Company capitalized acquisition costs totaling \$87.2 million for the year ended December 31, 2012. Under the previous guidance, the amount capitalized would have been \$102.5 million for the same period. The total effect of implementing this guidance was a \$15.3 million decrease in the amount capitalized and a \$8.2 million decrease in the amortization expense for the year ended December 31, 2012. The total amortization expense was \$85.9 million for the year ended December 31, 2012. The net effect of implementing this guidance was a \$7.1 million increase in underwriting and other operating expense for the year ended December 31, 2012.

#### 5. New Accounting Standards

In February 2013, the Financial Accounting Standards Board issued Accounting Standards Update Number 2013-02, Reporting of Amounts Reclassified Out of Accumulated Other Comprehensive Income (Topic 220). This update requires companies to report the effect of significant reclassifications out of accumulated other comprehensive income on the respective line items in net income if the amount being reclassified is required under GAAP to be reclassified in its entirety to net income. For other amounts that are not required under GAAP to be reclassified in their entirety to net income in the same reporting period, an entity is required to cross-reference other disclosures required under GAAP that provide additional detail about those amounts. This update became effective prospectively for reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2012. The Company adopted this update beginning in the first quarter of 2013. The adoption of this new guidance did not have a material impact on the Company's consolidated financial condition or results of operations.

In September 2013, the Internal Revenue Service issued final regulations governing the income tax treatment of acquisitions, dispositions, and repairs of tangible property, Final Tangible Property Regulations Under Sections 162 and 263 (T.D. 9636). Taxpayers are required to follow the new regulations in taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 2014. The Company does not expect that these regulations will have a material impact on the Company's consolidated financial condition or results of operations.



## 6. Fair Value of Financial Instruments

The carrying value and the estimated fair value of the Company's financial instruments as of December 31, were as follows:

	2013		2012	
	Carrying Value	Estimated Fair Value	Carrying Value	Estimated Fair Value
Financial assets	(in thousands)			
Investments (Note 7)	\$2,344,858	\$2,344,858	\$2,149,514	\$2,149,514
Cash and cash equivalents	34,503	34,503	140,661	140,661
Restricted cash and cash equivalents	6,564	6,564	5,353	5,353
Financial liabilities				
Notes payable (Note 12)	\$102,000	\$105,540	\$112,000	\$118,207

The Company's estimates of fair value for financial liabilities are based on the variable interest rate for the Company's existing line of credit to discount future payments on notes payable, and have been determined to be Level 2 fair value measurements, as defined below.

Assets and liabilities recorded at fair value on the consolidated balance sheets are categorized based upon the levels of judgment associated with the inputs used to measure their fair value. Level inputs are defined as follows:

Level 1 - Inputs are unadjusted quoted market prices for identical assets or liabilities in active markets at the measurement date.

Level 2 - Inputs other than Level 1 prices that are observable for similar assets or liabilities through corroboration with market data at the measurement date.

Level 3 - Inputs that are unobservable that reflect management's best estimate of what market participants would use in pricing the assets or liabilities at the measurement date.

The following methods and assumptions were used to determine the fair value of each class of assets and liabilities recorded at fair value in the consolidated balance sheets:

Fair values of available-for-sale fixed maturity and equity securities are based on quoted market prices, where available. These fair values are obtained primarily from third party pricing services, which generally use Level 1 or Level 2 inputs. The Company obtains a quoted price for each security from third party pricing services, which are derived through recently reported trades for identical or similar securities. For securities not actively traded, the third party pricing services may use quoted market prices of similar instruments or discounted cash flow analyses, incorporating inputs that are currently observable in the markets for similar securities. Inputs that are often used in the valuation methodologies include, but are not limited to, broker quotes, benchmark yields, credit spreads, default rates, and prepayment speeds. The Company also performs a quarterly analysis on the prices received from third parties to determine whether the prices are reasonable estimates of fair value, including confirming the fair values of these securities through observable market prices using an alternative pricing source. If differences are noted in this review, the Company may obtain additional information from other pricing services to validate the quoted price. There were no adjustments to prices obtained from third party pricing services as of December 31, 2013 or 2012 that were material to the consolidated financial statements.

If quoted market prices and an estimate determined by using objectively verifiable information are unavailable, the Company produces an estimate of fair value based on internally developed valuation techniques, which, depending on the level of observable market inputs, will render the fair value estimate as Level 2 or Level 3. The Company bases all of its estimates of fair value for assets on the bid price as it represents what a third party market participant would be willing to pay in an arm's length transaction.

These methods of valuation will only produce an estimate of fair value if there is objectively verifiable information to produce a valuation. If objectively verifiable information is not available, the Company would be required to produce an estimate of fair value using some of the same methodologies, making assumptions for market based inputs that are unavailable.

Estimates of fair value for fixed maturity securities are based on estimates using objectively verifiable information and are included in the amount disclosed in Level 2 of the hierarchy. The fair value estimates for determining Level 3 fair

value include the Company's assumptions about risk assessments and market participant assumptions based on the best information available, including quotes from market makers and other broker/dealers recognized as market participants, using standard or trade derived inputs, new issue data, monthly payment information, cash flow generation, prepayment speeds, spread adjustments, or rating updates.

60

---

Edgar Filing: LaNeve Stephen - Form 4

The following table presents the items in the accompanying consolidated balance sheets that are stated at fair value and the fair value measurements.

	December 31, 2013			December 31, 2012		
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
	(in thousands)					
Fixed maturity securities						
U.S. Treasuries	\$—	\$170,897	\$—	\$—	\$152,490	\$—
U.S. Agencies	—	68,118	—	—	93,967	—
States and municipalities	—	735,180	—	—	758,516	—
Corporate securities	—	833,296	—	—	676,243	—
Residential mortgage-backed securities	—	258,431	—	—	252,852	—
Commercial mortgage-backed securities	—	65,110	—	—	56,120	—
Asset-backed securities	—	51,514	—	—	34,240	—
Total fixed maturity securities	\$—	\$2,182,546	\$—	\$—	\$2,024,428	\$—
Equity securities	\$162,312	\$—	\$—	\$125,086	\$—	\$—

The Company had no Level 3 investment activity during the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012.

#### 7. Investments

The cost or amortized cost, gross unrealized gains, gross unrealized losses, and estimated fair value of the Company's investments were as follows:

	Cost or Amortized Cost	Gross Unrealized Gains	Gross Unrealized Losses	Estimated Fair Value
	(in thousands)			
At December 31, 2013				
Fixed maturity securities				
U.S. Treasuries	\$163,951	\$7,073	\$(127)	\$170,897
U.S. Agencies	64,985	3,137	(4)	68,118
States and municipalities	698,979	40,595	(4,394)	735,180
Corporate securities	814,283	28,671	(9,658)	833,296
Residential mortgage-backed securities	255,187	7,979	(4,735)	258,431
Commercial mortgage-backed securities	67,066	316	(2,272)	65,110
Asset-backed securities	51,613	54	(153)	51,514
Total fixed maturity securities	2,116,064	87,825	(21,343)	2,182,546
Equity securities	89,689	72,844	(221)	162,312
Total investments	\$2,205,753	\$160,669	\$(21,564)	\$2,344,858
At December 31, 2012				
Fixed maturity securities				
U.S. Treasuries	\$138,839	\$13,651	\$—	\$152,490
U.S. Agencies	88,202	5,765	—	93,967
States and municipalities	689,776	68,740	—	758,516
Corporate securities	627,047	49,461	(265)	676,243
Residential mortgage-backed securities	236,461	16,488	(97)	252,852
Commercial mortgage-backed securities	54,755	1,410	(45)	56,120
Asset-backed securities	34,062	211	(33)	34,240
Total fixed maturity securities	1,869,142	155,726	(440)	2,024,428
Equity securities	81,067	45,399	(1,380)	125,086
Total investments	\$1,950,209	\$201,125	\$(1,820)	\$2,149,514



Edgar Filing: LaNeve Stephen - Form 4

The amortized cost and estimated fair value of fixed maturity securities at December 31, 2013, by contractual maturity, are shown below. Expected maturities differ from contractual maturities because borrowers may have the right to call or prepay obligations with or without call or prepayment penalties.

	Amortized Cost	Estimated Fair Value
	(in thousands)	
Due in one year or less	\$147,157	\$149,369
Due after one year through five years	777,480	812,822
Due after five years through ten years	655,280	676,124
Due after ten years	162,281	169,176
Mortgage and asset-backed securities	373,866	375,055
Total	\$2,116,064	\$2,182,546

The following is a summary of investments that have been in a continuous unrealized loss position for less than 12 months and those that have been in a continuous unrealized loss position for 12 months or greater as of December 31, 2013 and 2012.

	December 31, 2013			December 31, 2012		
	Estimated Fair Value	Gross Unrealized Losses	Number of Issues	Estimated Fair Value	Gross Unrealized Losses	Number of Issues
	(dollars in thousands)					
Less than 12 months:						
Fixed maturity securities						
U.S. Treasuries	\$22,242	\$(127 )	7	\$—	\$—	—
U.S. Agencies	1,631	(4 )	1	—	—	—
States and municipalities	127,965	(4,394 )	34	—	—	—
Corporate securities	326,608	(9,536 )	112	36,338	(265 )	12
Residential mortgage-backed securities	129,586	(4,170 )	58	14,629	(28 )	6
Commercial mortgage-backed securities	35,878	(1,372 )	9	10,432	(45 )	4
Asset-backed securities	25,825	(52 )	13	16,714	(33 )	5
Total fixed maturity securities	669,735	(19,655 )	234	78,113	(371 )	27
Equity securities	6,140	(208 )	17	11,645	(1,207 )	35
Total less than 12 months	\$675,875	\$(19,863 )	251	\$89,758	\$(1,578 )	62
Greater than 12 months:						
Fixed maturity securities						
Corporate securities	\$6,174	\$(122 )	3	\$—	\$—	—
Residential mortgage-backed securities	5,609	(565 )	11	2,341	(69 )	17
Commercial mortgage-backed securities	9,324	(900 )	3	—	—	—
Asset-backed securities	8,938	(101 )	3	—	—	—
Total fixed maturity securities	30,045	(1,688 )	20	2,341	(69 )	17
Equity securities	303	(13 )	1	456	(173 )	4
Total greater than 12 months	\$30,348	\$(1,701 )	21	\$2,797	\$(242 )	21
Total available-for-sale:						
Fixed maturity securities						
U.S. Treasuries	\$22,242	\$(127 )	7	\$—	\$—	—
U.S. Agencies	1,631	(4 )	1	—	—	—
States and municipalities	127,965	(4,394 )	34	—	—	—
Corporate securities	332,782	(9,658 )	115	36,338	(265 )	12
Residential mortgage-backed securities	135,195	(4,735 )	69	16,970	(97 )	23

Explanation of Responses:

Edgar Filing: LaNeve Stephen - Form 4

Commercial mortgage-backed securities	45,202	(2,272	) 12	10,432	(45	) 4
Asset-backed securities	34,763	(153	) 16	16,714	(33	) 5
Total fixed maturity securities	699,780	(21,343	) 254	80,454	(440	) 44
Equity securities	6,443	(221	) 18	12,101	(1,380	) 39
Total available-for-sale	\$706,223	\$(21,564	) 272	\$92,555	\$(1,820	) 83

62

---

Based on reviews of the fixed maturity securities, the Company determined that unrealized losses for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 were primarily the result of changes in 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 on not selling 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 to maturity.

Based on reviews of the equity securities for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012, the Company recognized total impairments of \$0.1 million and \$0.7 million in the fair values of one and eleven equity securities as a result of the severity and duration of the change in fair values of those securities as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively.

Realized gains on investments, net and the change in unrealized gains (losses) on fixed maturity and equity securities are determined on a specific-identification basis and were as follows:

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
	(in thousands)		
Realized gains on investments, net			
Fixed maturity securities			
Gross gains	\$761	\$3,779	\$19,463
Gross losses	(7)	(5)	(148)
Realized gains on fixed maturity securities, net	\$754	\$3,774	\$19,315
Equity securities			
Gross gains	\$9,093	\$2,156	\$1,169
Gross losses	(318)	(882)	(323)
Realized gains on equity securities, net	\$8,775	\$1,274	\$846
Total	\$9,529	\$5,048	\$20,161
Change in unrealized (losses) gains			
Fixed maturity securities	\$(88,803)	\$8,803	\$47,897
Equity securities	28,603	10,935	2,235
Total	\$(60,200)	\$19,738	\$50,132

Net investment income was as follows:

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
	(in thousands)		
Fixed maturity securities	\$69,458	\$71,293	\$80,361
Equity securities	3,812	3,248	1,885
Cash equivalents and restricted cash	99	351	279
	73,369	74,892	82,525
Investment expenses	(2,605)	(2,529)	(2,408)
Net investment income	\$70,764	\$72,363	\$80,117

The Company is required by various state laws and regulations to keep securities or letters of credit in depository accounts with the states in which it does business. As of December 31, 2013 and 2012, securities having a fair value of \$602.4 million and \$530.6 million, respectively, were on deposit. These laws and regulations govern not only the amount but also the type of security that is eligible for deposit. The deposits are limited to fixed maturity securities in all states. Additionally, certain reinsurance contracts require Company funds to be held in trust for the benefit of the ceding reinsurer to secure the outstanding liabilities assumed by the Company. The fair value of securities held in trust for reinsurance at December 31, 2013 and 2012 was \$32.2 million and \$35.0 million, respectively. The Company's debt was secured by fixed maturity securities and restricted cash and cash equivalents that had a fair value of \$95.1 million and \$110.4 million at December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively.



## 8. Property and Equipment

Property and equipment consists of the following:

	As of December 31,	
	2013	2012
	(in thousands)	
Furniture and equipment	\$2,896	\$2,896
Leasehold improvements	4,439	4,309
Computers and software	38,146	33,477
Automobiles	1,208	1,369
	46,689	42,051
Accumulated amortization and depreciation	(30,073	) (27,371
Property and equipment, net	\$16,616	\$14,680

Depreciation and amortization expenses related to property and equipment for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011 were \$5.2 million, \$4.4 million, and \$4.8 million, respectively. Internally developed software costs of \$0.8 million and \$0.9 million were capitalized during the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively.

## 9. Income Taxes

The Company files a consolidated federal income tax return. The insurance subsidiaries pay premium taxes on gross premiums written in lieu of some states' income or franchise taxes.

The provision for income taxes consisted of the following:

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
	(in thousands)		
Current tax (benefit) expense:			
Federal	\$89	\$1,964	\$(652
State	22	(312	) 154
Total current tax (benefit) expense	111	1,652	(498
Deferred federal tax (benefit) expense	(10,761	) (10,999	) (1,608
Income tax (benefit) expense	\$(10,650	) \$(9,347	) \$(2,106

The difference between the statutory federal tax rate of 35% and the Company's effective tax rate on net income before income taxes as reflected in the consolidated statements of comprehensive income was as follows:

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
	(in thousands)		
Expense computed at statutory rate	\$18,611	\$34,140	\$16,281
Dividends received deduction and tax-exempt interest	(9,033	) (9,304	) (11,409
Pre-Privatization reserve adjustments, excluding LPT	(7,400	) —	(1,602
LPT deferred gain amortization	(6,632	) (9,305	) (6,755
LPT Reserve Adjustment	(6,645	) (25,672	) —
Other	449	794	1,379
Income tax (benefit) expense	\$(10,650	) \$(9,347	) \$(2,106

On January 1, 2000, EICN assumed the assets, liabilities, and operations of the Fund pursuant to legislation passed in the 1999 Nevada Legislature (the Privatization). Prior to the Privatization, the Fund was a part of the State of Nevada and therefore was not subject to federal income tax; accordingly, it did not take an income tax deduction with respect to the establishment of its unpaid loss and LAE reserves. Due to favorable loss experience after the Privatization, it was determined that certain of the pre-Privatization unpaid loss and LAE reserves assumed by EICN as part of the Privatization were no longer necessary and the unpaid loss and LAE reserves were reduced accordingly. Such downward adjustments of pre-Privatization unpaid loss reserves increases GAAP net income, but does not increase taxable income. There were downward adjustments of pre-Privatization unpaid loss reserves of \$27.5 million and \$4.6 million for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2011, respectively.



The LPT Reserve Adjustments for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 increased GAAP net income by \$19.0 million and \$73.3 million, respectively, but did not increase taxable income. The LPT Contingent Commission Adjustment during the fourth quarter of 2012 increased net income by \$8.6 million, but did not increase taxable income.

As of December 31, 2013 and 2012, the Company had no unrecognized tax benefits.

Tax years 2008 through 2012 are subject to full examination by the federal taxing authority. Tax year 2006 is open to examination by the federal taxing authority only to the extent of benefits from the carry-back of certain capital losses from tax years 2008 and 2009. Currently, tax years 2006 through 2011 are under review by the federal taxing authority.

The significant components of deferred income taxes, net, were as follows as of December 31:

	2013		2012	
	Deferred Tax		Deferred Tax	
	Assets	Liabilities	Assets	Liabilities
	(in thousands)			
Unrealized capital gains, net	\$—	\$48,687	\$—	\$69,756
Deferred policy acquisition costs	—	15,323	—	13,692
Intangible assets	—	3,390	—	3,695
Loss reserve discounting for tax reporting	57,945	—	57,722	—
Unearned premiums	20,639	—	18,119	—
Allowance for bad debt	2,608	—	2,085	—
Stock based compensation	4,603	—	4,339	—
Accrued liabilities	8,292	—	5,095	—
Minimum tax credit	13,177	—	13,090	—
Net operating loss carryforward	22,832	—	15,111	—
Other	1,169	5,803	1,401	3,588
Total	\$131,265	\$73,203	\$116,962	\$90,731
Deferred income taxes, net	\$58,062		\$26,231	

At December 31, 2013, the Company had a \$65.2 million net operating loss carryforward. This is due to expire beginning 2029 through 2032.

Deferred tax assets are required to be reduced by a valuation allowance if it is more likely than not that all or some portion of the deferred tax asset will not be realized. Realization of the deferred income tax asset is dependent on the Company generating sufficient taxable income in future years as the deferred income tax charges become currently deductible for tax reporting purposes. Although realization is not assured, management believes that it is more likely than not that the net deferred income tax asset will be realized.

## 10. Liability for Unpaid Losses and Loss Adjustment Expenses

The following table represents a reconciliation of changes in the liability for unpaid losses and LAE.

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
	(in thousands)		
Unpaid losses and LAE, gross of reinsurance, at beginning of period	\$2,231,540	\$2,272,363	\$2,279,729
Less reinsurance recoverable, excluding bad debt allowance, on unpaid losses and LAE	805,386	940,840	956,043
Net unpaid losses and LAE at beginning of period	1,426,154	1,331,523	1,323,686
Losses and LAE, net of reinsurance, incurred in:			
Current year	494,579	386,044	280,683
Prior years	6,934	1,800	1,127
Total net losses and LAE incurred during the period	501,513	387,844	281,810
Deduct payments for losses and LAE, net of reinsurance, related to:			
Current year	78,523	67,672	55,405
Prior years	261,708	225,541	218,568
Total net payments for losses and LAE during the period	340,231	293,213	273,973
Ending unpaid losses and LAE, net of reinsurance	1,587,436	1,426,154	1,331,523
Reinsurance recoverable, excluding bad debt allowance, on unpaid losses and LAE	743,055	805,386	940,840
Unpaid losses and LAE, gross of reinsurance, at end of period	\$2,330,491	\$2,231,540	\$2,272,363

Total net losses and LAE included in the above table excludes the impact of the amortization of the Deferred Gain and the LPT Reserve Adjustment (Note 11).

The increase in the estimate of incurred losses and LAE attributable to insured events in prior years in 2013 included \$5.0 million related to actual paid losses that were more than expected and the impact of new information on selected patterns of claims emergence and payment used in the projection of future loss payments and \$1.9 million related to the Company's assigned risk business. In 2012 and 2011, the increase in the estimate of incurred losses and LAE attributable to insured events in prior years was primarily related to the Company's assigned risk business.

In California, where the Company's operations began on July 1, 2002, the actuaries' and management's initial expectations of ultimate losses and patterns of loss emergence and payment were based on benchmarks derived from analyses of historical insurance industry data in California. No historical data from the Company's California insurance subsidiary existed prior to July 1, 2002; however, some historical data was available for the prior years for some of the market segments the Company entered in California, but was limited as to the number of loss reserve evaluation points available. The industry-based benchmarks were judgmentally adjusted for the anticipated impact of significant environmental changes, specifically the enactment of major changes to the statutory workers' compensation benefit structure and the manner in which claims are administered and adjudicated in California. The actual emergence and payment of claims by the Company's California insurance subsidiary has been more favorable than those initial expectations through 2008, due at least in part to the enactment of the major changes in the California workers' compensation environment; however, our recent loss experience, beginning in 2010, indicates an upward trend in medical costs that is reflected in our loss reserves. Additionally, the Company's indemnity claims frequency (the number of claims expressed as a percentage of payroll) increased year-over-year in 2013. The Company's estimates assume that increasing medical cost trends will continue and will impact our long-term claims costs and loss reserves.

In Nevada, the Company has compiled a lengthy history of workers' compensation claims payment patterns based on the business of the Fund and EICN, but the emergence and payment of claims in recent years has been more favorable than in the long-term history in Nevada with the Fund. The expected patterns of claim payments and emergence used in the projection of the Company's ultimate claim payments are based on both the long and short-term historical paid data. In recent evaluations, claim patterns have continued to emerge in a manner consistent with short-term historical data.

Consequently, the Company's selection of claim projection patterns has relied more heavily on patterns observed in recent years.

The Company continues to develop its own loss experience in California and will rely more on its experience and less on historical industry data in projecting its reserve requirements as such data becomes available. As the actual experience of the Company emerges, it will continue to evaluate prior estimates, which may result in additional adjustments in reserves.

Loss reserves shown in the consolidated balance sheets are net of \$22.9 million and \$21.0 million for anticipated subrogation recoveries as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively.

## 11. Reinsurance

The Company is involved in the cession and assumption of reinsurance with non-affiliated companies. Risks are reinsured with other companies on both a quota share and excess of loss basis.

Reinsurance transactions reflected in the accompanying consolidated statements of comprehensive income were as follows:

	Years Ended December 31,					
	2013		2012		2011	
	Written	Earned	Written	Earned	Written	Earned
	(in thousands)					
Direct premiums	\$680,459	\$645,449	\$575,373	\$507,770	\$416,106	\$369,365
Assumed premiums	9,412	8,305	4,954	4,345	2,406	2,533
Gross premiums	689,871	653,754	580,327	512,115	418,512	371,898
Ceded premiums	(11,405 )	(11,405 )	(10,651 )	(10,651 )	(8,474 )	(8,474 )
Net premiums	\$678,466	\$642,349	\$569,676	\$501,464	\$410,038	\$363,424
Ceded losses and LAE incurred	\$10,732		\$2,544		\$46,327	

Ceded losses and LAE incurred includes the amortization of the Deferred Gain and the LPT Reserve Adjustment.

## Excess of Loss Reinsurance

The Company maintains reinsurance for losses from a single occurrence or event in excess of \$5.0 million and up to \$200.0 million, subject to a \$2.0 million annual aggregate deductible and certain exclusions. The reinsurance coverage includes coverage for acts of terrorism, excluding nuclear, biological, chemical, and radiological events. Any liability outside the coverage limits of the reinsurance program is retained by the Company.

## LPT Agreement

Recoverables from reinsurers on unpaid losses and LAE amounted to \$0.7 billion and \$0.8 billion at December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively. At each of December 31, 2013 and 2012, \$0.6 billion and \$0.7 billion, respectively, of those recoverables was related to the LPT Agreement that was entered into in 1999 by the Fund and assumed by EICN. Under the LPT Agreement, substantially all of the Fund's losses and LAE on claims incurred prior to July 1, 1995, have been ceded to three unaffiliated reinsurers on a 100% quota share basis. Investments have been placed in trust by the three reinsurers as security for payment of the reinsured claims. Under the LPT Agreement, initially \$1.5 billion in liabilities for the incurred but unpaid losses and LAE related to claims incurred prior to July 1, 1995, were reinsured for consideration of \$775.0 million. The LPT Agreement provides coverage up to \$2.0 billion. Through December 31, 2013, the Company has paid losses and LAE claims totaling \$0.6 billion related to the LPT Agreement. The Company amortized \$14.6 million, \$17.0 million, and \$18.2 million of the Deferred Gain for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively. Additionally, the Deferred Gain was reduced by \$19.0 million and \$73.3 million in 2013 and 2012, respectively, due to favorable LPT Reserve Adjustments (Note 2). There was no LPT Reserve Adjustment in 2011.

## 12. Notes Payable

Notes payable is comprised of the following:

	December 31,	
	2013	2012
	(in thousands)	
Amended Credit Facility, due December 31, 2015 with variable interest, as described below	\$70,000	\$80,000
Dekania Surplus Note, due April 30, 2034 with variable interest of 425 basis points above 90-day LIBOR	10,000	10,000
ICONS Surplus Note, due May 26, 2034 with variable interest of 425 basis points above 90-day LIBOR	12,000	12,000
Alesco Surplus Note, due December 15, 2034 with variable interest of 405 basis points above 90-day LIBOR	10,000	10,000
Balance	\$102,000	\$112,000

Edgar Filing: LaNeve Stephen - Form 4

On December 28, 2010, the Company entered into the Third Amended and Restated Credit Agreement (Amended Credit Facility) with Wells Fargo Bank, National Association (Wells Fargo), under which the Company is 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) \$70.0 million line of credit from January 1, 2014

67

---

through December 31, 2014; and (e) \$60.0 million line of credit from January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015. Amounts outstanding bear interest at a rate equal to, at the Company's 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 cash and cash equivalents that had a fair value of \$95.1 million at December 31, 2013. The Amended Credit Facility contains customary non-financial covenants and requires EHI to maintain 5% of the aggregate commitment amount of the line of credit in cash and cash equivalents at all times. The Company is currently in compliance with all applicable covenants. Interest paid during the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011 totaled \$1.6 million, \$1.9 million, and \$2.0 million, respectively. In accordance with the terms of the contract, a repayment of \$10.0 million was made toward the Amended Credit Facility on December 31, 2013. EPIC has a \$10.0 million surplus note to Dekania CDO II, Ltd. issued as part of a pooled transaction. The note matures in 2034 and became callable by the Company in the second quarter of 2009. The terms of the note provide for quarterly interest payments at a rate 425 basis points in excess of the 90-day LIBOR. Both the payment of interest and repayment of the principal under this note and the surplus notes described in the succeeding two paragraphs are subject to the prior approval of the Florida Department of Financial Services. Interest paid during each of the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011 was \$0.5 million. Interest accrued as of December 31, 2013 and 2012 was \$0.1 million.

EPIC has a \$12.0 million surplus note to ICONS, Inc. issued as part of a pooled transaction. The note matures in 2034 and became callable by the Company in the second quarter of 2009. The terms of the note provide for quarterly interest payments at a rate 425 basis points in excess of the 90-day LIBOR. Interest paid during each of the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011 was \$0.6 million. Interest accrued at each of December 31, 2013 and 2012 was \$0.1 million.

EPIC has a \$10.0 million surplus note to Alesco Preferred Funding V, LTD issued as part of a pooled transaction. The note matures in 2034 and became callable by the Company in the fourth quarter of 2009. The terms of the note provide for quarterly interest payments at a rate 405 basis points in excess of the 90-day LIBOR. Interest paid during the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011 was \$0.3 million, \$0.5 million, and \$0.4 million, respectively. Interest accrued as of December 31, 2013 and 2012 was less than \$0.1 million.

Principal payment obligations on notes payable outstanding at December 31, 2013, were as follows:

Year	Principal Due (in thousands)
2014	\$ 10,000
2015	60,000
2016	—
2017	—
2018	—
Thereafter	32,000
Total	\$ 102,000

### 13. Commitments and Contingencies

#### Leases

The Company leases office facilities and certain equipment under operating and capital leases. Most leases have renewal options, typically with increased rental rates during the option period. Certain of these leases contain options to purchase the property at amounts that approximate fair market value; other leases contain options to purchase at a bargain purchase price. At December 31, 2013, the remaining lease terms expire over the next five years.

The future lease payments for the next five years on these non-cancelable operating and capital leases at December 31, 2013, were as follows:

Year	Operating Leases (in thousands)	Capital Leases
2014	\$6,044	\$1,518
2015	4,704	689
2016	3,308	314

Edgar Filing: LaNeve Stephen - Form 4

2017	1,969	314
2018	616	180
Total	\$16,641	\$3,015

Included in the future minimum capital lease payments are future interest charges of \$0.4 million. Facilities rent expense was \$5.0 million, \$5.2 million, and \$5.1 million for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively.

68

---

Property held under capital leases is included in property and equipment as follows:

Asset Class	2013	2012
	(in thousands)	
Furniture and equipment	\$—	\$100
Computers and software	3,295	2,904
Automobiles	1,208	1,369
	4,503	4,373
Accumulated amortization	(1,681	) (1,758
Total	\$2,822	\$2,615

#### Contingencies Surrounding Insurance Assessments

All of the states where the Company's insurance subsidiaries are licensed to transact business require property and casualty insurers doing business within the respective state to pay various insurance assessments. The Company accrues 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 defers these costs and recognizes them as an expense as the related premiums are earned. The Company had an accrued liability for guaranty fund assessments, second injury funds assessments, and other insurance assessments totaling \$13.1 million and \$8.5 million as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively. These liabilities are generally expected to be paid over one to eighty year periods based on individual states' regulations. The Company also recorded an asset of \$5.1 million and \$1.7 million, as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively, for prepaid policy charges still to be collected in the future from policyholders, assessments that may be recovered through a reduction in future premium taxes in certain states, and for expected refunds of certain prepaid assessments based on a change in the Company's premium between the time when the prepayment was made and when the assessment becomes due. These assets are expected to be realized over two to ten year periods in accordance with their type and individual states' regulations.

#### 14. Stockholders' Equity

##### Stock Repurchase Programs

Since the Company's initial public offering in January 2007 through December 31, 2013, the Company repurchased a total of 23,372,974 shares of common stock at an average cost per share of \$15.51, which is reported as treasury stock, at cost, on the accompanying consolidated balance sheets. There were no stock repurchase programs authorized by the Board of Directors as of December 31, 2013.

#### 15. Stock-Based Compensation

The Employers Holdings, Inc. Amended and Restated Equity and Incentive Plan (the Plan) is administered by the Compensation Committee of the Board of Directors, which is authorized to grant, at its discretion, awards to officers, employees, non-employee directors, consultants, and independent contractors. The maximum number of common shares reserved for grants of awards under the Plan is 7,105,838 shares. The Plan provides for the grant of stock options (both incentive stock options and nonqualified stock options), stock appreciation rights, shares of restricted stock, restricted stock units (RSUs), performance stock units (PSUs), and other stock-based awards.

As of December 31, 2013, nonqualified stock options, RSUs, and PSUs have been granted, but no incentive stock options, stock appreciation rights, or share of restricted stock have been granted under the Plan.

Compensation costs are recognized based on expected performance, if applicable, net of any estimated forfeitures on a straight-line basis over the employee requisite service periods. Forfeiture rates are based on historical experience and are adjusted in subsequent periods for differences in actual forfeitures from those estimated. Net stock-based compensation expense recognized in the accompanying consolidated statements of comprehensive income was as follows:

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
	(in thousands)		
Stock-based compensation expense related to:			
Nonqualified stock options	\$1,715	\$1,958	\$1,648
RSUs	2,276	2,435	2,094
PSUs	1,631	1,748	—

Edgar Filing: LaNeve Stephen - Form 4

Total	5,622	6,141	3,742
Less: related tax benefit	1,968	1,972	1,220
Net stock-based compensation expense	\$3,654	\$4,169	\$2,522

69

---

### Nonqualified Stock Options

The Company awarded "Founders' grants" to employees, excluding senior officers, in February 2007. The founders' grants awards vested pro-rata on each of the first three anniversaries of the effective date of the Company's initial public offering. The options expire seven years from the date of grant. Additional grants of nonqualified stock options awarded to certain officers of the Company have service vesting periods of four years after the date awarded and vest 25% on each of the subsequent four anniversaries of such date. The options are subject to accelerated vesting in certain limited circumstances, such as: death or disability, or in connection with a change of control of the Company. The options expire seven years from the date of grant.

The fair value of the stock options granted is estimated using a Black-Scholes option pricing model that uses the assumptions noted in the following table. During the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, the expected stock price volatility used to value the options granted in 2013, 2012, and 2011 was based on the volatility of the Company's historical stock price since February 2007. The expected term of the options granted in 2013, 2012, and 2011 was calculated using the 'plain-vanilla' calculation provided in the guidance of the Securities and Exchange Commission's Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 107. The dividend yield was calculated using amounts authorized by the Board of Directors. The risk-free interest rate is the yield on the grant date of the options of U.S. Treasury zero coupon securities with a maturity comparable to the expected term of the options.

The Company anticipates issuing new shares upon exercise of stock options.

The fair value of the stock options granted during the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011 were calculated using the following weighted average assumptions:

	2013	2012	2011	
Expected volatility	40.1	% 42.7	% 43.6	%
Expected life (in years)	4.8	4.8	4.8	
Dividend yield	1.1	% 1.4	% 1.2	%
Risk-free interest rate	0.8	% 1.1	% 1.9	%
Weighted average grant date fair values of options granted	\$7.04	\$5.64	\$7.01	

Changes in outstanding stock options for the year ended December 31, 2013 were as follows:

	Number of Options	Weighted-Average Exercise Price	Weighted Average Remaining Contractual Life
Options outstanding at December 31, 2010	1,763,103	\$16.14	4.8 years
Granted	355,063	19.81	6.2 years
Exercised	(92,646)	) 16.53	
Expired	(49,445)	) 17.32	
Forfeited	(187,369)	) 15.36	
Options outstanding at December 31, 2011	1,788,706	16.90	4.3 years
Granted	242,300	17.02	6.2 years
Exercised	(101,261)	) 14.13	
Expired	(98,973)	) 18.78	
Options outstanding at December 31, 2012	1,830,772	16.97	3.7 years
Granted	162,800	22.24	6.2 years
Exercised	(411,295)	) 17.89	
Expired	(6,900)	) 17.00	
Forfeited	(28,479)	) 18.90	
Options outstanding at December 31, 2013	1,546,898	17.24	3.4 years
Exercisable at December 31, 2013	983,441	16.22	2.6 years

At December 31, 2013, the Company had yet to recognize \$2.4 million in deferred compensation related to nonqualified stock option grants and expects to recognize these costs on a straight-line basis over the next 39 months. The fair value of options vested and the intrinsic value of outstanding and exercisable options as of December 31, were as follows:

Edgar Filing: LaNeve Stephen - Form 4

	2013	2012	2011
	(in thousands)		
Fair value of options vested	\$1,809	\$1,948	\$1,929
Intrinsic value of outstanding options	22,288	6,616	3,332
Intrinsic value of exercisable options	15,173	3,918	1,508

70

---

The intrinsic value of options exercised was \$3.7 million, \$0.5 million, and \$0.3 million for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011.

#### RSUs

The Company has awarded RSUs to non-employee members of the Board of Directors and certain officers of the Company. The RSUs awarded to non-employee members of the Board of Directors vest on the first anniversary of the award date. RSU grants allow each non-employee Director to decide whether to defer settlement of the RSUs until six months after termination of Board service or settle the RSUs at vesting. Dividend equivalents are granted to Directors who elected to defer settlement of the RSUs after the grants vested. RSUs awarded to officers of the Company have a service vesting period of four years from the date awarded and vest 25% on each of the subsequent four anniversaries of such date. These RSUs are subject to accelerated vesting in certain limited circumstances, such as: death or disability of the holder, or in connection with a change of control of the Company.

Changes in outstanding RSUs for the year ended December 31, 2013 were as follows:

	Number of RSUs	Weighted Average Grant Date Fair Value
RSUs outstanding at December 31, 2010	428,515	\$14.98
Granted	157,570	19.12
Forfeited	(62,618)	) 15.29
Vested	(105,278)	) 15.25
RSUs outstanding at December 31, 2011	418,189	16.42
Granted	117,065	17.15
Vested	(128,992)	) 16.36
RSUs outstanding at December 31, 2012	406,262	16.65
Granted	84,215	23.57
Forfeited	(10,924)	) 18.85
Vested	(121,207)	) 15.97
RSUs outstanding at December 31, 2013	358,346	18.44
Vested but unsettled RSUs at December 31, 2013	94,074	16.05

At December 31, 2013, the Company had yet to recognize \$3.0 million in deferred compensation related to RSU grants and expects to recognize these costs on a straight-line basis over the next 39 months. The grant date fair value of RSUs vested and the intrinsic value of vested RSUs for the years ended December 31, were as follows:

	2013	2012	2011
	(in thousands)		
Grant date fair value of RSUs vested	\$1,936	\$2,110	\$1,605
Intrinsic value of vested RSUs	2,872	2,235	1,865

The intrinsic value of outstanding RSUs was \$11.3 million, \$8.4 million, and \$7.6 million at December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011.

#### PSUs

The Company awarded PSUs to certain officers of the Company as follows:

Date of Grant	Target Number Awarded	Fair Value on Date of Grant	Aggregate Fair Value on Date of Grant (in thousands)
March 2012 <sup>(1)</sup>	158,900	\$17.02	\$2,704
March 2013 <sup>(1)</sup>	147,440	22.24	3,279

<sup>(1)</sup> The PSUs have a performance period of three years and are subject to certain performance goals, based on the Company's statutory combined ratio, with payouts that range from 0% to 200% of the target awards.

At December 31, 2013, the Company had yet to recognize \$1.7 million in deferred compensation related to PSU grants and expects to recognize these costs on a straight-line basis over the next 12 months. This is based on the expectation of the Company achieving the 200% target rate for the 2012 PSUs and 0% for the 2013 PSUs.



## 16. Statutory Matters

## Statutory Financial Data

The combined capital stock, surplus, and net income of the Company's insurance subsidiaries (EICN, ECIC, EPIC, and EAC), prepared in accordance with the statutory accounting practices (SAP) of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) as well as SAP permitted by the states of California, Florida, and Nevada, were as follows:

	December 31,	
	2013	2012
	(in thousands)	
Capital stock and unassigned surplus	\$373,994	\$334,800
Paid in capital	174,900	134,900
Surplus notes	32,000	32,000
Total statutory surplus	\$580,894	\$501,700

Net income for the Company's insurance subsidiaries prepared in accordance with SAP for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 was \$19.3 million, \$13.5 million and \$13.8 million, respectively.

Treatment of the LPT Agreement and the surplus notes (see Notes 11 and 12) are the primary differences in the SAP-basis capital stock and total surplus of the insurance subsidiaries of \$580.9 million and \$501.7 million, and the GAAP-basis equity of the Company of \$568.7 million and \$539.4 million as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively. Under SAP accounting, the retroactive reinsurance gain resulting from the LPT Agreement is recorded as a special component of surplus (special surplus funds) in the initial year of the contract, and not reported as unassigned surplus until the Company has recovered amounts in excess of the original consideration paid. The special surplus funds are also reduced by the amount of extraordinary dividends as approved by the Nevada Division of Insurance. Under SAP, the surplus notes are recorded as a separate component of surplus. Under SAP, changes to the estimated contingent profit commission under the LPT Agreement are reflected in commission expense in the period that the estimate is revised.

## Insurance Company Dividends

The ability of EHI to pay dividends on the Company's common stock and to pay other expenses will be dependent to a significant extent upon the ability of the Nevada domiciled insurance company, EICN, and the Florida domiciled insurance company, 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. ECIC and EAC have the ability to declare and pay dividends to EICN and EPIC, respectively, subject to certain restrictions. The amount of dividends each of the Company's subsidiaries may pay to their immediate parent is limited by the laws of their respective state of domicile.

Nevada law limits the payment of cash dividends by EICN to its parent by providing that payments cannot be made except from available and accumulated surplus, otherwise unrestricted (unassigned), and derived from realized net operating profits and realized and unrealized capital gains. A stock dividend may be paid out of any available surplus. A cash or stock dividend prohibited by these restrictions may only be declared and distributed as an extraordinary dividend upon the prior approval of the Nevada Commissioner of Insurance (Nevada Commissioner). EICN may not pay such an extraordinary dividend or make an extraordinary distribution until the Nevada Commissioner either approves or does not disapprove the payment within 30 days after receiving notice of its declaration. An extraordinary dividend or distribution is defined by statute to include any dividend or distribution of cash or property whose fair market value, together with that of other dividends or distributions made within the preceding 12 months, exceeds the greater of: (a) 10% of EICN's statutory surplus as regards to policyholders at the next preceding December 31; or (b) EICN's statutory net income, not including realized capital gains, for the 12-month period ending at the next preceding December 31. As of December 31, 2013, EICN had positive unassigned surplus of \$324.9 million. During 2013, EICN did not pay any dividends. The maximum dividends that may be paid in 2014 by EICN without prior approval is \$32.7 million.

Under Florida law, without regulatory approval, EPIC may pay dividends if they do not exceed the greater of: the lesser of 10% of surplus or net income, not including realized capital gains, plus a 2-year carry forward; 10% of surplus, with dividends payable limited to unassigned funds minus 25% of unrealized capital gains; or, the lesser of

10% of surplus or net investment income plus a 3-year carry forward with dividends payable limited to unassigned funds minus 25% of unrealized capital gains. During 2013, EPIC did not pay any dividends. The maximum dividends that may be paid in 2014 by EPIC without prior approval is \$25.4 million.

Regulatory Requirements and Restrictions

ECIC is subject to regulation by the California Department of Insurance (California DOI). The ability of ECIC to pay dividends was further limited by restrictions imposed by the California DOI in its approval of the Company's October 1, 2008 reinsurance pooling agreement. Under that approval: (a) ECIC must initiate discussions of its business plan with the California DOI if its

premium to policyholder surplus ratio exceeds 1.5 to 1; (b) ECIC will not exceed a ratio of premium to policyholder surplus of 2 to 1 without approval of the California DOI; (c) if at any time ECIC's policyholder surplus decreases to 80% or less than the September 30, 2008 balance, ECIC shall cease issuing new policies in California, but may continue to renew existing policies until it has (i) received a capital infusion to bring its surplus position to the same level as that as of September 30, 2008 and (ii) submitted a new business plan to the California DOI; (d) ECIC will maintain a risk based capital (RBC) level of at least 350%; (e) should ECIC fail to comply with any commitments listed herein, ECIC will consent to any request by the California DOI to cease issuing new policies in California, but may continue to renew existing policies until such time that as ECIC is able to achieve full compliance with each commitment; and (f) the obligations listed shall only terminate with the written consent of the California DOI. During the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, ECIC was in compliance with these statutes.

EPIC and EAC are subject to regulation by the Florida Department of Financial Services (FDfs). Florida statute Section 624.408 requires EPIC and EAC to maintain minimum capital and surplus of the greater of \$4.0 million or 10% of total liabilities. Florida statute Section 624.4095 requires EPIC and EAC to maintain a ratio of written premiums times 1.25 to surplus of no greater than 10-to-1 for gross written premiums and 4-to-1 for net written premiums. During the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, EPIC and EAC were in compliance with these statutes.

Additionally, EICN, ECIC, EPIC, and EAC are required to comply with NAIC RBC requirements. RBC is a method of measuring the amount of capital appropriate for an insurance company to support its overall business operations in light of its size and risk profile. NAIC RBC standards are used by regulators to determine appropriate regulatory actions relating to insurers that show signs of weak or deteriorating conditions. As of December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, EICN, ECIC, EPIC, and EAC each had total adjusted capital above all regulatory action levels.

#### 17. Accumulated Other Comprehensive Income, Net

Accumulated other comprehensive income, net, is comprised of unrealized gains on investments classified as available-for-sale, net of deferred tax expense. The following table summarizes the components of accumulated other comprehensive income, net:

	Years Ended December 31,	
	2013	2012
	(in thousands)	
Net unrealized gain on investments, before taxes	\$ 139,105	\$ 199,305
Deferred tax expense	(48,687)	(69,756)
Total accumulated other comprehensive income, net	\$ 90,418	\$ 129,549

#### 18. Employee Benefit and Retirement Plans

The Company maintains a 401(k) defined contribution plan covering all eligible Company employees (the Employers 401(k) Plan). Under the Employers 401(k) Plan, the Company's safe harbor matching consists of 100% matching contribution on salary deferrals up to 3% of compensation and then 50% matching contribution on salary deferrals from 3% to 5% of compensation. The Company's contribution to the Employers 401(k) Plan was \$1.2 million, \$1.5 million, and \$1.5 million for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively.

#### 19. Earnings Per Share

Basic earnings per share includes no dilution and is computed by dividing income applicable to stockholders by the weighted average number of shares outstanding for the period. Diluted earnings per share reflect the potential dilutive impact of all convertible securities on earnings per share. Diluted earnings per share includes shares assumed issued under the "treasury stock method," which reflects the potential dilution that would occur if outstanding options were to be exercised.

The following table presents the net income and the weighted average shares outstanding used in the earnings per share calculations.

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
	(in thousands, except share data)		
Net income available to stockholders—basic and diluted	\$63,824	\$106,891	\$48,623
Weighted average number of shares outstanding—basic	31,142,534	31,476,056	37,284,425
Effect of dilutive securities:			
Nonqualified stock options	464,334	104,837	74,430
PSUs	177,040	—	—
RSUs	154,259	141,164	150,232
Dilutive potential shares	795,633	246,001	224,662
Weighted average number of shares outstanding—diluted	31,938,167	31,722,057	37,509,087

Diluted earnings per share exclude outstanding options and other common stock equivalents in periods where the inclusion of such options and common stock equivalents would be anti-dilutive. The following table presents options, PSUs and RSUs that were excluded from diluted earnings per share.

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
Options excluded as the exercise price was greater than the average market price	—	900,180	1,095,920
Options, PSUs and RSUs excluded under the treasury method, as the potential proceeds on settlement or exercise was greater than the value of shares acquired	162,800	401,200	505,635

#### 20. Selected Quarterly Financial Data (Unaudited)

Quarterly results for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 were as follows:

	2013 Quarters Ended			
	March 31	June 30	September 30	December 31
	(in thousands, except per share data)			
Net premiums earned	\$147,975	\$159,953	\$164,429	\$169,992
Realized gains on investments, net	794	3,866	1,075	3,794
Losses and loss adjustment expenses	108,272	112,638	105,767	136,902
Commission expense	18,393	20,127	19,946	19,792
Underwriting and other operating expenses	31,540	32,249	32,493	29,042
Income tax (benefit) expense	(226	) 1,209	(3,274	) (8,359
Net income	7,490	14,588	27,585	14,161
Earnings per common share:				
Basic	0.24	0.47	0.88	0.45
Diluted	0.24	0.46	0.86	0.44

	2012 Quarters Ended			
	March 31	June 30	September 30	December 31
	(in thousands, except per share data)			
Net premiums earned	\$109,900	\$118,955	\$131,766	\$140,843
Realized gains on investments, net	1,778	945	1,838	487
Losses and loss adjustment expenses	80,518	87,809	96,823	22,760
Commission expense	13,816	16,621	16,681	18,462
Underwriting and other operating expenses	32,989	30,316	30,147	31,192
Income tax (benefit) expense	(4,421	) (2,309	) (1,173	) (1,444
Net income	6,340	5,016	7,766	87,769
Earnings per common share:				
Basic	0.19	0.16	0.25	2.85
Diluted	0.19	0.16	0.25	2.82

#### Fourth Quarter Adjustments

The fourth quarter of 2013 was impacted by two changes in estimate, including: (1) a favorable LPT Reserve Adjustment, which reduced the Company's losses and LAE by \$8.9 million, and increased net income by \$8.9 million, or \$0.28 per basic and diluted share, respectively; and (2) an LPT Contingent Commission Adjustment, which reduced the Company's losses and LAE by \$2.7 million, resulting in an increase to net income of \$2.7 million, or \$0.09 and \$0.08 per basic and diluted share, respectively.

The fourth quarter of 2012 was impacted by two changes in estimate, including: (1) a favorable LPT Reserve Adjustment, which reduced the Company's losses and LAE by \$73.3 million, and increased net income by \$73.3 million, or \$2.38 and \$2.36 per basic and diluted share, respectively; and (2) an LPT Contingent Commission Adjustment, which reduced the Company's losses and LAE by \$8.6 million, resulting in an increase to net income of \$8.2 million, or \$0.27 and \$0.26 per basic and diluted share, respectively. See Note 2.

#### Net Premiums Earned

The increase in net premiums earned in 2013 and 2012 was primarily due to increasing policy count and rates.

#### Losses and LAE

Losses and LAE increased in the second quarter of 2013, primarily due to an increase in net earned premiums. The decrease in losses and LAE during the third quarter of 2013 was primarily due to a LPT Reserve Adjustment of \$10.1 million. The increase in losses and LAE during the fourth quarter of 2013 was primarily due to an increase in the current accident year loss estimate to 77.0%, which increased the Company's losses and LAE by \$21.5 million. Additionally, there was \$5.1 million of unfavorable prior accident year loss development during the fourth quarter of 2013. These increases were partially offset by an \$8.9 million LPT Reserve Adjustment and a \$2.7 million LPT Contingent Commission Adjustment during the fourth quarter of 2013.

Losses and LAE increased through the first three quarters of 2012 primarily due to an increase in net earned premiums. The decrease in losses and LAE during the fourth quarter of 2012 was primarily due to a LPT Reserve Adjustment of \$73.3 million and a LPT Contingent Commission Adjustment of \$8.6 million.

#### Commission Expense

The increased commission expense in the second quarter of 2013 was primarily due to higher net earned premiums. The increased commission expense in the second quarter of 2012 was primarily due to higher agency incentive commissions due to increased agent production during that quarter. The third quarter of 2012 was impacted by higher net earned premiums, partially offset by a decrease in the accrual for agency incentives. The increased commission expense in the fourth quarter of 2012 was primarily due to higher net earned premiums and an increase in the accrual for agency incentives.

#### Underwriting and Other Operating Expenses

Underwriting and other operating expenses increased through the third quarter of 2013 primarily due to increased compensation expenses and increased premium taxes and assessments as net premiums earned increased. During the fourth quarter of 2013, underwriting and other operating expenses decreased primarily due to a decrease in

compensation expense.

Underwriting and other operating expenses increased by \$3.0 million, \$2.2 million, \$1.3 million, and \$0.6 million in the first, second, third, and fourth quarters of 2012, respectively, due to the implementation of new accounting guidance for deferred policy acquisition costs. Additionally, underwriting and other operating expenses increased throughout 2012 primarily due to increased compensation expenses and increased premium taxes and assessments as net premiums earned increased.

75

---

#### Income Taxes

Income tax expense (benefit) for interim periods is measured using an estimated effective tax rate for the annual period based on projected net income and tax adjustments. On an interim basis, actual results to date replace the projections and the annual effective tax rate is updated. A cumulative change is recorded in the quarter the effective tax rate changes.

The income tax benefit in the third and fourth quarters of 2013 was primarily related to a reallocation of reserves from non-taxable periods prior to January 1, 2000, which reduced our effective tax rate by 13.9 percentage points for the year ended December 31, 2013. The changes in estimate related to the LPT Reserve Adjustments in the third and fourth quarters of 2013 and the LPT Contingent Commission Adjustment in the fourth quarter of 2013 were tax-exempt. Additionally, the increase in current accident year loss estimate in the fourth quarter of 2013 reduced taxable net income during the quarter.

The changes in estimate related to the LPT Reserve Adjustment and LPT Contingent Commission Adjustment in the fourth quarter of 2012 were tax-exempt.

Item 9. Changes in and Disagreements with Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosure

None.

#### Item 9A. Controls and Procedures

##### Disclosure Controls and Procedures

We maintain disclosure controls and procedures (as defined in Rules 13a-15(e) and 15d-15(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the Exchange Act)) designed to provide reasonable assurance that the information required to be reported in the Exchange Act filings is recorded, processed, summarized and reported within the time periods specified and pursuant to SEC regulations, including controls and procedures designed to ensure that this information is accumulated and communicated to management, including its chief executive officer and chief financial officer, as appropriate, to allow timely decisions regarding the required disclosure. It should be noted that, because of inherent limitations, our disclosure controls and procedures, however well designed and operated, can provide only reasonable, and not absolute, assurance that the objectives of the disclosure controls and procedures are met.

Our management, with the participation of our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, evaluated the effectiveness of our disclosure controls and procedures as of the end of the period covered by this report. Based upon that evaluation, our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer have concluded that our disclosure controls and procedures were effective at a reasonable level of assurance as of December 31, 2013.

##### Management's Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

Management's report regarding internal control over financial reporting is set forth in Item 8 of this report under the caption "Management's Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting" and incorporated herein by reference.

##### Attestation Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm

The attestation report of the Company's independent registered public accounting firm regarding internal control over financial reporting is set forth in Item 8 of this report under the caption "Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting" and incorporated herein by reference.

##### Changes in Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

There have not been any changes in our internal control over financial reporting (as such term is defined in Rules 13a-15(f) in the Exchange Act) during the fourth fiscal quarter of the year to which this report relates that have materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, our internal control over financial reporting.

#### Item 9B. Other Information

None.

### PART III

#### Item 10. Directors, Executive Officers, and Corporate Governance

The information required by Item 10 with respect to our executive officers and key employees is included under the caption "Executive Officers of the Registrant" in our Proxy Statement for the 2014 Annual Meeting and is incorporated herein by reference. We plan to file such Proxy Statement within 120 days after December 31, 2013, the end of our fiscal year.

The information required by Item 10 with respect to our Directors is included under the caption "Election of Directors" in our Proxy Statement for the 2014 Annual Meeting of Stockholders and is incorporated herein by reference.

76

---

The information required by Item 10 with respect to compliance with Section 16 of the Exchange Act is included under the caption “Section 16(a) Beneficial Ownership Reporting Compliance” in our Proxy Statement for the 2014 Annual Meeting of Stockholders and is incorporated herein by reference.

The information required by Item 10 with respect to our audit committee and our audit committee financial expert is included under the caption “The Board of Directors and its Committees - Audit Committee” in our Proxy Statement for the 2014 Annual Meeting of Stockholders and is incorporated herein by reference.

The information required by Item 10 with respect to our Code of Business Conduct and Ethics and our Code of Ethics for Senior Financial Officers is posted on our website at [www.employers.com](http://www.employers.com) in the Investors section under “Governance.” We will post information regarding any amendment to, or waiver from, our Code of Business Conduct and Ethics on our website in the Investor section under Governance.

#### Item 11. Executive Compensation

The information required by Item 11 is included under the captions “Compensation Discussion and Analysis,” “Compensation Committee Report” and “Compensation Committee Interlocks and Insider Participation” in our Proxy Statement for the 2014 Annual Meeting of Stockholders and is incorporated herein by reference.

Item 12. Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters  
 Certain information required by Item 12 is included under the captions “Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management” and “Compensation Discussion and Analysis” in our Proxy Statement for the 2014 Annual Meeting of Stockholders and is incorporated herein by reference.

#### Equity and Incentive Plan

The following table gives information about our common stock that may be issued upon the exercise of options, warrants, and rights under all of our existing equity compensation plans as of December 31, 2013. We do not have any plans not approved by our stockholders. Our equity compensation plans are discussed further in Note 15 in the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements, which are included herein.

Plan Category	(a) Number of securities to be issued upon exercise of outstanding options, warrants, and rights	(b) Weighted-average exercised price of outstanding options, warrants, and rights	(c) Number of securities remaining available for further issuance under compensation plans (excluding securities reflected in column (a))
Equity compensation plans approved by stockholders	1,546,898	17.24	3,774,776
Equity compensation plans not approved by stockholders	—	—	—
Total	1,546,898	\$17.24	3,774,776

#### Item 13. Certain Relationships and Related Transactions and Director Independence

The information required by Item 13 is included under the captions “Certain Relationships and Related Transactions” and “Director Independence” in our Proxy Statement for the 2014 Annual Meeting of Stockholders and is incorporated herein by reference.

#### Item 14. Principal Accountant Fees and Services

The information required by Item 14 with respect to the fees and services of Ernst & Young LLP, our independent registered public accounting firm, is included under the caption “Audit Matters” in our Proxy Statement for the 2014 Annual Meeting of Stockholders and is incorporated herein by reference.

PART IV

Item 15. Exhibits and Financial Statement Schedules

The following consolidated financial statements are filed in Item 8 of Part II of this report:

	Page
Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm	<u>49</u>
Consolidated Balance Sheets as of December 31, 2013 and 2012	<u>50</u>
Consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Income for each of the three years ended December 31, 2013	<u>51</u>
Consolidated Statements of Stockholders' Equity for each of the three years ended December 31, 2013	<u>52</u>
Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows for each of the three years ended December 31, 2013	<u>53</u>
Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements	<u>54</u>

Financial Statement Schedules:

Schedule II. Condensed Financial Information of Registrant	<u>79</u>
Schedule VI. Supplemental Information Concerning Property-Casualty Insurance Operations	<u>84</u>

Pursuant to Rule 7-05 of Regulation S-X, Schedules I, III, IV, and V have been omitted as the information to be set forth therein is included in the notes to the audited consolidated financial statements.

Schedule II. Condensed Financial Information of Registrant  
Employers Holdings, Inc.

Condensed Balance Sheets

	December 31,	
	2013	2012
	(in thousands, except share data)	
Assets		
Investments:		
Investment in subsidiaries	\$447,619	\$382,985
Investment in securities available-for-sale (amortized cost \$108,890 in 2013 and \$133,606 in 2012)	114,152	143,534
Equity Securities at fair value (amortized cost \$42,861 in 2013 and \$30,678 in 2012)	52,503	32,256
Total investments	614,274	558,775
Cash and cash equivalents	6,371	40,149
Restricted cash and cash equivalents	567	200
Intercompany receivable	—	4,390
Federal income taxes receivable	7,427	5,649
Deferred income taxes, net	11,039	11,595
Other assets	2,702	2,817
Total assets	\$642,380	\$