

**Market and Government Failure in Insuring and  
Mitigating Natural Catastrophes:  
How Long-Term Contracts Can Help**

**Howard Kunreuther**  
*The Wharton School*  
*University of Pennsylvania*

**Erwann Michel-Kerjan**  
*The Wharton School*  
*University of Pennsylvania*

Prepared for the American Enterprise Institute Conference  
on Private Markets and Public Insurance Programs  
Wohlstetter Conference Center  
Washington, D.C.

March 2009

Working Paper # 2009-03-18

---

Risk Management and Decision Processes Center  
The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania  
3730 Walnut Street, Jon Huntsman Hall, Suite 500  
Philadelphia, PA, 19104  
USA

Phone: 215-898-4589

Fax: 215-573-2130

<http://opim.wharton.upenn.edu/risk/>

---

## CITATION AND REPRODUCTION

This document appears as Working Paper of the Wharton Risk Management and Decision Processes Center, The Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania. Comments are welcome and may be directed to the authors.

This paper may be cited as: Howard Kunreuther and Erwann Michel-Kerjan, "Market and Government Failure in Insuring and Mitigating Natural Catastrophes: How Long-Term Contracts Can Help." Risk Management and Decision Processes Center, The Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, March 2009.

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and publication does not imply their endorsement by the Wharton Risk Center and the University of Pennsylvania. This paper may be reproduced for personal and classroom use. Any other reproduction is not permitted without written permission of the authors.

### THE WHARTON RISK MANAGEMENT AND DECISION PROCESSES CENTER

Established in 1984, the Wharton Risk Management and Decision Processes Center develops and promotes effective corporate and public policies for low-probability events with potentially catastrophic consequences through the integration of risk assessment, and risk perception with risk management strategies. Natural disasters, technological hazards, and national and international security issues (e.g., terrorism risk insurance markets, protection of critical infrastructure, global security) are among the extreme events that are the focus of the Center's research.

The Risk Center's neutrality allows it to undertake large-scale projects in conjunction with other researchers and organizations in the public and private sectors. Building on the disciplines of economics, decision sciences, finance, insurance, marketing and psychology, the Center supports and undertakes field and experimental studies of risk and uncertainty to better understand how individuals and organizations make choices under conditions of risk and uncertainty. Risk Center research also investigates the effectiveness of strategies such as risk communication, information sharing, incentive systems, insurance, regulation and public-private collaborations at a national and international scale. From these findings, the Wharton Risk Center's research team – over 50 faculty, fellows and doctoral students – is able to design new approaches to enable individuals and organizations to make better decisions regarding risk under various regulatory and market conditions.

The Center is also concerned with training leading decision makers. It actively engages multiple viewpoints, including top-level representatives from industry, government, international organizations, interest groups and academics through its research and policy publications, and through sponsored seminars, roundtables and forums.

More information is available at <http://opim.wharton.upenn.edu/risk>.

# **Market and Government Failure in Insuring and Mitigating Natural Catastrophes: How Long-Term Contracts Can Help**

Howard C. Kunreuther and Erwann O. Michel-Kerjan  
The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania<sup>1</sup>

Prepared for the American Enterprise Institute Conference on  
Private Markets and Public Insurance Programs  
Wohlstetter Conference Center  
Washington, D.C.  
Revised version – March 16, 2009

---

<sup>1</sup> We would like to thank Jeffrey Brown, David Torregrosa and other participants in the American Enterprise Institute Conference on Private Markets and Public Insurance Programs on January 15, 2009 for helpful comments on a previous version of this paper. Support from the Wharton Risk Management and Decision Processes Center, the Climate Decision Making Center (CDMC) located in the Department of Engineering and Public Policy (cooperative agreement between the NSF (SES-0345798) and Carnegie Mellon University) and a grant from the Federal Emergency Management Agency Preparedness Policy, Planning and Analysis Division in the National Preparedness Directorate, U.S. Department of Homeland Security (Grant # 2008-GA-T8-K004) is acknowledged. The views and opinions expressed are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the United States Government or FEMA.

“Insurance plays a vital role in America’s economy by helping households and businesses manage risks. (...) When insurance prices reflect underlying economic costs they can encourage a more efficient allocation of resources. Efforts to keep premiums for insurance against catastrophe hazards artificially low, whether through regulation or through subsidized government programs, can encourage excessively risky behavior on the part of those who might be affected by future catastrophes.”  
**Economic Report of the President (2007), pp.122-123<sup>2</sup>**

## 1. Introduction

Given the hundreds of billions of dollars of economic losses due to catastrophes that occurred in the United States since 2001, it is difficult to realize that when Hurricane Hugo hit the country in 1989, it was the first catastrophe to inflict more than \$1 billion of insured losses. But times have changed because of the occurrence of a series of unprecedented large-scale natural disasters that have hit the United States repeatedly in the past few years. Times have changed because of the increased terrorism threat worldwide including the potential for nuclear attacks. Times have changed because of the possibility of international pandemics, world cyber-failure and the financial crises we are currently experiencing. In other words, we have entered a new era of catastrophes.

While all the above risks are different in character, they have several important features in common: uncertainty and wide variance in losses from one year to the next. Experts and decision makers face challenges in assessing the risks associated with these extreme events, developing strategies for reducing future losses and facilitating the recovery process following a major catastrophe.

Turning to natural disasters, the world has experienced large-scale losses and fatalities due to the increasing concentration of population and activities in high-risk coastal regions of the country. In southeast Asia, the tsunami in December 2004 killed more than 280,000 people residing in coastal areas. Cyclone Nargis, which made landfall in Myanmar in May 2008, killed an estimated 140,000 people, making it the deadliest natural disaster in the recorded history of the country. The same month, the Great Sichuan Earthquake in China is estimated to have killed nearly 70,000 people, 374,000 were injured, and almost five million were made homeless. (Munich Re, 2008).

But even in a developed country like the United States, which has extensive experience with natural catastrophes and resources to adequately prepare, the 2004 and 2005 hurricane seasons have demonstrated the lack of adequate loss reduction measures and emergency preparedness capacity to deal with large-scale natural disasters. Hurricane Katrina, which hit Louisiana and Mississippi at the end of August 2005, killed 1,300 people and forced 1.5 million people to evacuate the affected area – a historic record for the country. Economic damages are estimated in the range of US\$150 to US\$200 billion.

---

<sup>2</sup> It is quite remarkable that 2007 was the first year that the *Economic Report of the President* devoted a chapter to catastrophe risk insurance.

After two relatively quiet hurricane seasons in 2006 and 2007 in the United States, a series of hurricanes made landfall in 2008, causing billions of dollars in direct economic losses along the Caribbean Basin and in the United States. Hurricane Ike was the most expensive individual event in 2008 with an estimated privately insured loss of \$16 billion, followed by Hurricane Gustav with insured losses estimated at \$4 billion. Based on these figures, Hurricane Ike ranks as the third most devastating weather-related disaster in U.S. history, after Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Andrew which hit southeast Florida in August 1992. (Swiss Re, 2008).

These recent catastrophes highlight the challenges of mitigating and financing natural disasters, issues that are now high on the business and policy agendas of many countries. The question is not whether other large-scale catastrophes will occur, but when and how frequently they will strike, and the extent of the damage and fatalities they will cause. Now is the time to develop and implement economically sound policies and strategies for managing the risk and consequences of future disasters. It is important for us to take a longer term view of these issues given the tendency for individuals to be myopic in their thinking and to misperceive risks. A coherent strategy is necessary to ensure a sustainable recovery from large-scale disasters and the appropriate future development of hazard-prone areas. But these issues are complex. They challenge our capacity as a nation to work together despite different agendas of key stakeholders and legislators regarding the role and responsibilities of the private and public sectors in dealing with catastrophic risks. Absence of leadership in this area will inevitably lead to unnecessary loss of lives and economic destruction in the devastated regions.

This paper complements other analyses in this volume by focusing on the risk of large-scale natural disasters, although we believe the concepts and proposals for managing these risks more effectively have relevance to other types of extreme events such as terrorism and catastrophic accidents.<sup>3</sup> The paper is organized as follows. **Section 2** discusses the evolution over the past four decades of economic and insured losses due to major catastrophes and the key drivers of this change. **Section 3** proposes four guiding principles for developing sustainable insurance and mitigation programs. **Section 4** focuses on the behavioral biases, notably myopia, that discourage individuals from investing in cost effective protective measures. **Section 5** proposes long-term insurance contracts combined with long-term loans for overcoming these biases. The National Flood Insurance Program, which is due for renewal/changes by Congress in September 2009, is a natural candidate for these contracts as discussed in **Section 6**. The paper concludes with a brief summary and suggestions for future research.


---

<sup>3</sup> For a detailed analysis on terrorism insurance by the authors, see Kunreuther and Michel-Kerjan (2004), Wharton Risk Center (2005), Michel-Kerjan and Pedell (2006) and Michel-Kerjan et al. (2009). For a detailed analysis of the question of natural disaster insurance and mitigation in the United States, see Kunreuther and Michel-Kerjan (2009).

## 2. A New Era of Catastrophes

### *Recent Changes in the Impacts of Extreme Events*

The economic and insured losses from great natural catastrophes such as hurricanes, earthquakes and floods worldwide have increased significantly in recent years, as shown in figure 1 (each vertical bar represents the total economic losses, and the darker zone represents the insured portion of it). A comparison of these economic losses over time reveals a huge increase: \$53.6 billion (1950–1959), \$93.3 billion (1960–1969), \$161.7 billion (1970–1979), \$262.9 billion (1980–1989), and \$778.3 billion (1990–1999). Between 2000 and 2008, there were \$620.6 billion in losses, principally a result of the 2004, 2005 and 2008 hurricane seasons, which produced historic records.




**FIGURE 1. EVOLUTION OF “GREAT NATURAL CATASTROPHES” WORLDWIDE, 1950-2007**

*Sources: Data from Munich Re, 2008 Geo Risks Research – in U.S. \$ billion indexed to 2007*

Catastrophes have had a more devastating impact on insurers since 1990 than in the entire history of insurance. Between 1970 and the mid-1980s, annual insured losses from natural disasters (including forest fires) were in the \$3 billion to \$4 billion range. The insured losses from Hurricane Hugo, which made landfall in Charleston, South Carolina in September, 1989, exceeded \$4 billion (1989 prices). There was a radical increase in insured losses in the early 1990s, with Hurricane Andrew in Florida (\$23.7 billion in 2007 dollars) and the Northridge earthquake in California (\$19.6 billion in 2007 dollars). The four hurricanes in Florida in 2004 (Charley, Frances, Ivan, and Jeanne) collectively totaled almost \$33 billion in insured losses. Hurricane Katrina alone cost insurers and reinsurers an estimated \$46 billion, with total losses paid by private insurers resulting from major natural catastrophes in 2005 at \$87 billion.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> This figure excludes payment by the U.S. National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) for damage due to 2005 flooding (over \$20 billion in claims).

Figure 2 depicts the upward trend in worldwide insured losses from catastrophes between 1970 and 2008.<sup>5</sup>



**FIGURE 2. WORLDWIDE EVOLUTION OF CATASTROPHE INSURED LOSSES, 1970-2008**

*(9/11: All lines, including property and business interruption (BI); in U.S. \$ billion indexed to 2007; except for 2008 which is current)<sup>6</sup>*

*Source: Wharton Risk Center with data from Swiss Re and Insurance Information Institute*

Table 1 reveals the twenty most costly catastrophes for the insurance sector from 1970 to 2007 (in 2007 dollars). Of these twenty major events, ten have occurred since 2001, nine of which were in the United States. Hurricane Andrew and the Northridge earthquake were the first two catastrophes that the industry experienced where losses were greater than \$10 billion (designated as *super-cats*) and caused insurers to reflect on whether risks from natural disasters were still insurable. To assist them in making this determination, many firms began using catastrophe models to estimate the likelihood and consequences to their insured portfolios from specific disasters in hazard-prone areas (Grossi and Kunreuther, 2005). With the exception of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, all of the events in the top twenty were natural disasters.<sup>7</sup> More than 80 percent of these were weather-related events—hurricanes and typhoons, storms, and floods—with nearly three-quarters of the claims in the United States.

<sup>5</sup> Munich Re and Swiss Re, the two leading reinsurers in the world, do not use the same definition of catastrophic losses. Natural disasters inflicting insured losses above \$38.7 million or total losses above \$77.5 million are considered major catastrophes by Swiss Re. Munich Re considers a higher threshold, which explains the difference between Figure 1 and Figure 2. For example, when Munich Re estimated insured loss from natural disasters at about \$42 billion in 2004, Swiss Re's estimate was over \$52 billion. As a result, most figures used in the literature regarding the evolution of catastrophe loss actually underestimate the real effect on insurers.

<sup>6</sup> Man-made catastrophes include: major fires and explosions (in a chemical plant or oil refinery for instance), aviation/rail/shipping-related losses (fires, crashes, collisions) as well as mining accidents and collapse of infrastructure.

<sup>7</sup> See the chapter by Jaffee and Russell in this volume for a detailed discussion of terrorism insurance markets.

Losses resulting from natural catastrophes and man-made disasters in 2006 were far below the losses in 2004 and 2005. Of the \$48 billion in catastrophe-related economic losses, \$16 billion was covered by insurance (\$11 billion for natural disasters and \$5 billion for man-made). During the past twenty years, only 1988 and 1997 had insured losses lower than those in 2006. According to Munich Re, there were 950 natural catastrophes in 2007, the most since 1974. They inflicted nearly \$27 billion in insured losses. Swiss Re estimates that insured losses soared to \$50 billion for the industry in 2008 making it one of the three costliest years ever. Natural catastrophes accounted for \$43 billion of these losses with man-made disasters making up the remaining \$7 billion. (Swiss Re, 2008).

**TABLE 1. THE 20 MOST COSTLY INSURED IN THE WORLD, 1970-2007  
(INDEXED TO 2007 PRICES)**

<b>U.S.\$ Billion (indexed to 2007)</b>	<b>Event</b>	<b>Victims (Dead or missing)</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Area of Primary Damage</b>
46.3	Hurricane Katrina	1,836	2005	USA, Gulf of Mexico, et al.
35.5	9/11 Attacks	3,025	2001	USA
23.7	Hurricane Andrew	43	1992	USA, Bahamas
19.6	Northridge Earthquake	61	1994	USA
14.1	Hurricane Ivan	124	2004	USA, Caribbean, et al.
13.3	Hurricane Wilma	35	2005	USA, Gulf of Mexico, et al.
10.7	Hurricane Rita	34	2005	USA, Gulf of Mexico, et al.
8.8	Hurricane Charley	24	2004	USA, Caribbean, et al.
8.6	Typhoon Mireille	51	1991	Japan
7.6	Hurricane Hugo	71	1989	Puerto Rico, USA, et al.
7.4	Winterstorm Daria	95	1990	France, UK, et al.
7.2	Winterstorm Lothar	110	1999	France, Switzerland, et al.
6.1	Winterstorm Kyrill	54	2007	Germany, UK, NL, France
5.7	Storms and floods	22	1987	France, UK, et al.
5.6	Hurricane Frances	38	2004	USA, Bahamas
5.0	Winterstorm Vivian	64	1990	Western/Central Europe
5.0	Typhoon Bart	26	1999	Japan
4.5	Hurricane Georges	600	1998	USA, Caribbean
4.2	Tropical Storm Alison	41	2001	USA
4.2	Hurricane Jeanne	3,034	2004	USA, Caribbean, et al.

*Sources: Wharton Risk Center with data from Swiss Re and Insurance Information Institute*

The occurrence of damaging hurricanes is highly variable and uncertain from year to year. However, it is almost certain that in the coming years more hurricanes will strike the Atlantic and Gulf coasts. Other parts of the nation will experience severe floods (as occurred in the upper Midwest in 2008) and earthquakes, causing extreme damage to residential and commercial property and infrastructure.

There is a very clear message from these data. Twenty or thirty years ago, large-scale natural disasters were considered to be low-probability events. Today, they are not only causing considerably greater economic losses than in the past but also appear to be occurring at an accelerating pace. In this context, it is important to understand more fully the factors influencing these changes so as to design more effective programs for reducing losses from future disasters.

## *The Question of Attribution*

There are at least two principal socio-economic factors that directly influence the level of economic losses due to catastrophic events: *degree of urbanization* and *value at risk*. In 1950, approximately 30 percent of the world's population lived in cities. In 2000, about 50 percent of the world's population (6 billion) resided in urban areas. Projections by the United Nations show that by 2025, that figure will have increased to 60 percent based on a world population estimate of 8.3 billion people.

In the United States in 2003, 53 percent of the nation's population, or 153 million people, lived in the 673 U.S. coastal counties, an increase of 33 million people since 1980, according to the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration. And the nation's coastal population is expected to increase by more than 12 million by 2015 (Crossett, et. al., 2004).<sup>8</sup> Yet coastal counties, excluding Alaska, account for only 17 percent of land area in the United States.

In hazard-prone areas, this urbanization and increase of population also translates into greater concentration of exposure and hence a higher likelihood of catastrophic losses from future disasters. Insurance density is another critical socio-economic factor to consider when evaluating the evolution of insured loss due to weather-related catastrophes. These factors will continue to have a major impact on the level of insured losses from natural catastrophes. Given the growing concentration of exposure on the Gulf Coast, another hurricane like Katrina hitting the Gulf Coast is likely to inflict significant property damage unless strong mitigation measures are put in place.<sup>9</sup>

In order to better understand this new vulnerability, it is possible to calculate the total direct economic cost of the major hurricanes in the U.S. in the past century, adjusted for inflation, population and wealth normalization. More specifically, one can estimate what each of these hurricanes would have cost had they hit today. This exercise has been done in several studies. The most recent one by Pielke et al. (2008) normalizes to the year 2005 mainland U.S. hurricane damage for the period 1900–2005.

Table 2 provides estimates for the top 20 most costly hurricanes assuming they had occurred in 2005 using two approaches for normalizing these losses, each of which gives a cost estimate. The table provides the range of costs between these two estimates, the year when the hurricane originally occurred, the states that were the most seriously affected and the hurricane category on the Saffir-Simpson scale. The data reveal that the hurricane that hit Miami in 1926 would have been almost twice as costly as Hurricane Katrina had it occurred in 2005, and the Galveston hurricane of 1900 would have had total direct economic costs as high as those from Katrina. This means that independent of any possible change in weather patterns, we are very likely to see even more devastating disasters in the coming years because of the ongoing growth in values located in risk-prone areas.

There is another element to consider in determining how to adequately manage and finance catastrophe risks; the possible impact of a change in climate on future weather-related catastrophes. Between 1970 and 2004, storms and floods were responsible for over **90 percent** of

---

<sup>8</sup> This proportion varies depending on the definition of “coastal counties” one considers. Taking a more restrictive definition (that is, any county that has a coastline bordering the open ocean or associated sheltered water bodies or a county that contains V zones (as defined by the U.S. National Flood Insurance Program), one still finds that the proportion of population living in such counties is 30 percent. (Crowell et al., 2007).

<sup>9</sup> For additional data on the economic impact of future catastrophic hurricanes, see Financial Services Roundtable (2007).

the total economic costs of extreme weather-related events worldwide. Storms (*hurricanes* in the U.S. region, *typhoons* in Asia and *windstorms* in Europe) contributed to over 75 percent of insured losses. In constant prices (2004), insured losses from weather-related events averaged \$3 billion annually between 1970 and 1990 and then increased significantly to \$16 billion annually between 1990 and 2004 (Association of British Insurers, 2005). In 2005, 99.7 percent of all catastrophic losses worldwide were due to weather-related events (Mills and Lecomte, 2006).

**TABLE 2. TOP 20 HURRICANE SCENARIOS (1900-2005)  
RANKED USING 2005 INFLATION, POPULATION, AND WEALTH NORMALIZATION**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Hurricane</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Cost range (\$ billion) in 2005</b>
1	Miami (Southeast FL/MS/AL)	1926	4	140-157
2	Katrina (LA/MS)	2005	3	81
3	North Texas (Galveston)	1900	4	72-78
4	North Texas (Galveston)	1915	4	57-62
5	Andrew (Southeast FL and LA)	1992	5-3	54-60
6	New England (CT/MA/NY/RI)	1938	3	37-39
7	Southwest Florida	1944	3	35-39
8	Lake Okeechobee (Southeast Florida)	1928	4	32-34
9	Donna (FL-NC/NY)	1960	4-3	29-32
10	Camille (MS/Southeast LA/VA)	1969	5	21-24
11	Betsy (Southeast FL and LA)	1965	3	21-23
12	Wilma	2005	3	21
13	Agnes (FL/CT/NY)	1972	1	17-18
14	Diane (NC)	1955	1	17
15	4 (Southeast FL/LA/AL/MS)	1947	4-3	15-17
16	Hazel (SC/NC)	1954	4	16-23
17	Charley (Southwest FL)	2004	4	16
18	Carol (CT/NY/RI)	1954	3	15-16
19	Hugo (SC)	1989	4	15-16
20	Ivan (Northwest FL/AL)	2004	3	15

*Source: Data from Pielke et al. (2008)*

There have been numerous discussions and scientific debates as to whether the series of major hurricanes that occurred in 2004 and 2005 might be partially attributable to the impact of a change in climate.<sup>10</sup> One of the expected effects of global warming will be an increase in hurricane intensity. This has been predicted by theory and modeling, and substantiated by empirical data on climate change. Higher ocean temperatures lead to an exponentially higher evaporation rate in the atmosphere which increases the intensity of cyclones and precipitation. The results to date raise issues with respect to the insurability of weather-related catastrophes given that an increase in the number of major hurricanes over a shorter period of time is likely to translate into a greater number hitting the coasts, with a greater likelihood of damage to a much larger number of residences and commercial buildings today than in the 1940s.

<sup>10</sup> For more details on the scientific evidence regarding climate change and its impact see Stern Review (2006).

The combination of increasing urbanization, concentration of value in high-risk areas, and the potential impact of a change in weather-patterns raises questions for the insurance industry as to how they will provide protection against catastrophic risks in the future. Traditional insurance relies on geographical *and* time diversification, both of which are somewhat compromised by these recent trends. The appropriate the roles and responsibilities of the private and public sectors (as a source of financial support or as market regulator) is critical in this regard.

### **3. Guiding Principles for Mitigating and Insuring against Catastrophes**

To address the question as to what roles the private and public sectors can play in addressing these issues, we propose the following guiding principles for using the insurance infrastructure to deal more effectively with natural disasters:

***Principle 1: Premiums Reflecting Risk:*** *Insurance premiums should be based on risk in order to provide signals to individuals as to the hazards they face and to encourage them to engage in cost-effective mitigation measures to reduce their vulnerability to catastrophes. Risk-based premiums should also reflect the cost of capital that insurers need to integrate into their pricing to assure adequate return to their investors.*

The application of Principle 1 provides a clear signal of likely damage to those currently residing in areas subject to natural disasters and those who are considering moving into these regions. Risk-based premiums would also enable insurers to provide discounts to homeowners and businesses that invest in cost-effective loss-reduction mitigation measures. If insurance premiums are not risk based, insurers have no economic incentive to offer these discounts. In fact, they prefer not to offer coverage to these property owners because it is a losing proposition in the long run.

***Principle 2: Dealing with Equity and Affordability Issues.*** *Any special treatment given to homeowners currently residing in hazard-prone areas (for example, low-income uninsured or inadequately insured homeowners) should come from general public funding and not through insurance premium subsidies.*

Principle 2 reflects a concern for some residents in high-hazard areas who will be faced with large premium increases if insurers are permitted to adhere to Principle 1. As discussed in the next section, regulations imposed by state insurance commissioners keep premiums in many regions subject to hurricane damage artificially lower than the risk-based level.

Note that Principle 2 applies only to individuals who ***currently reside*** in a hazard-prone area. Those who decide to move to the area in the future should be charged premiums that reflect the risk. If they were provided with financial assistance from public sources to purchase insurance, the resulting public policy would directly encourage development in hazard-prone areas and exacerbate the potential for catastrophic losses from future disasters.

***Principle 3: Sufficient Demand for Coverage.*** *The demand by individuals and firms for insurance coverage with risk-based premiums should be sufficiently high so that insurers can cover the fixed costs of introducing a program for providing coverage and spreading the risk broadly throughout their portfolios. High demand for insurance would also reduce the level of state and federal relief to uninsured or underinsured homeowners in the aftermath of the next disaster.*

**Principle 4: Minimize Likelihood of Insolvency.** Insurers and reinsurers should determine how much coverage to offer, and what premium to charge against the risk so that the chances of insolvency are below some predefined acceptable threshold level.

Insurance regulators should play an important role here in assuring that insurers providing coverage in high-risk areas have a solid financial basis for doing so.

#### 4. The Behavioral Challenges: The Demand for Insurance and Mitigation

How effective can mitigation be in reducing exposure to future disaster? In order to shed some light on this question, we undertook an analysis of the impact that mitigation would have on reducing losses from hurricanes in four states: Florida, New York, South Carolina and Texas. (Kunreuther and Michel-Kerjan, 2009). In our analysis of the impact of mitigation, we consider two extreme cases: one in which no one has invested in mitigation, the other in which everyone has invested in predefined mitigation measures. From the U.S. Hurricane Model developed by the catastrophe modeling firm Risk Management Solutions (RMS), losses were calculated on a ground up and gross basis, assuming an appropriate mitigation measure across the insured portfolio. The mitigation measures were based on various assumptions for the different regions. For example, in Florida, the requirements were those defined by the Institute for Business and Home Safety’s (IBHS) *Fortified ... for Safer Living* program. As this program is only for new construction, when we describe an analysis using these recommendations, it is the retrofit techniques that are aligned with the features of the *Fortified* program. In New York, South Carolina and Texas, mitigation means the application of the latest building codes to the residential structures.<sup>11</sup>

Table 3 indicates the differences in losses and savings from adoption mitigation measures for hurricanes with return periods of 100, 250, and 500 years for each of the four states we are studying when these loss-reduction measures are in place.

**TABLE 3. MONEY SAVED IN REDUCED LOSSES FROM FULL MITIGATION FOR DIFFERENT RETURN PERIODS**

State	100-Year Event			250-Year Event			500-Year Event		
	Unmitigated Losses	Savings in Reduced Losses from Mitigation (\$)	Savings in Reduced Losses from Mitigation (%)	Unmitigated Losses	Savings in Reduced Losses from Mitigation (\$)	Savings in Reduced Losses from Mitigation (%)	Unmitigated Losses	Savings in Reduced Losses from Mitigation (\$)	Savings in Reduced Losses from Mitigation (%)
FL	\$84 billion	\$51 billion	61%	\$126 billion	\$69 billion	55%	\$160 billion	\$83 billion	52%
NY	\$6 billion	\$2 billion	39%	\$13 billion	\$5 billion	37%	\$19 billion	\$7 billion	35%
SC	\$4 Billion	\$2 billion	44%	\$7 billion	\$3 billion	41%	\$9 billion	\$4 billion	39%
TX	\$17 billion	\$6 billion	34%	\$27 billion	\$9 billion	32%	\$37 billion	\$12 billion	31%

<sup>11</sup> We are assuming that because these measures are incorporated in building codes they are cost-effective. In other words, the discounted long-term expected benefits from the mitigation measure over the projected life of the house is greater than its upfront costs. By obtaining detailed cost estimates for specific mitigation measures incorporated in building codes or Florida’s *Fortified ... for Safer Living* program one could rank their relative cost-effectiveness.

The analyses reveal that mitigation has the potential to significantly reduce losses from future hurricanes ranging from 61 percent in Florida for a 100-year return period loss to 31 percent in the state of New York for a 500-year return period loss. In Florida alone, the use of mitigation leads to a \$51 billion reduction in losses for a 100-year event and \$83 billion for a 500-year event. These findings are important given the costly capital needed to cover the tail of the distribution of extreme events. Adoption of mitigation measures on residential structures significantly reduces, if not eliminates, this tail in each of these four states.

The challenge, however, lies in making sure residents in hazard-prone areas invest in these mitigation measures. Indeed, recent extreme events have highlighted the challenges associated with reducing losses from hurricanes and other natural hazards due to what one of us has termed the *natural disaster syndrome* (Kunreuther, 1996). Many homeowners, private businesses and public sector organizations do not voluntarily adopt cost-effective loss-reduction measures. Hence, these areas are highly vulnerable and unprepared should a severe hurricane or other natural disaster occur. The magnitude of the destruction following a catastrophe often leads governmental agencies to provide disaster relief to victims even if prior to the event the government claimed that it had no intention of doing so. This combination of underinvestment in protection prior to the catastrophic event, together with the general taxpayer financing some of the recovery can be critiqued on both efficiency and equity grounds.

There are a range of informal mechanisms that explain this natural hazard syndrome. One relates to framing the problem imperfectly: experts focus on the likelihood and consequences as two key elements of the risk. Several studies show, however, that individuals rarely seek out probability estimates in making their decisions. When these data are given to them, decision makers often do not use the information. In one study, researchers found that only 22 percent of subjects sought out probability information when evaluating several risky managerial decisions. People have particular difficulty dealing with probabilistic information for small likelihood events. They need a context in which to evaluate the likelihood of an event occurring. They have a hard time gauging how concerned to feel about a 1 in 100,000 probability of death without some comparison points. Most people just do not know whether 1 in 100,000 is a large risk or a small risk. In one study, individuals could not distinguish the relative safety of a chemical plant that had an annual chance of experiencing a catastrophic accident that varied from 1 in 10,000 to 1 in 1 million (Kunreuther, Novemsky and Kahneman, 2001).

There is also evidence that firms and residents tend to ignore risks whose subjective odds are seen as falling below some threshold. Prior to a disaster, many individuals perceive its likelihood as sufficiently low that they contend *it will not happen to me*. As a result, they do not feel the need to invest voluntarily in protective measures, such as strengthening their house or buying insurance. It is only after the disaster occurs that these same individuals express remorse that they didn't undertake protective measures.

Another reason that individuals do not invest in protective measures is that they are highly myopic and tend to focus on the returns only over the next couple of years. In addition, there is extensive experimental evidence showing that human temporal discounting tends to be hyperbolic so that events in the distant future are disproportionately discounted relative to immediate ones. As an example, people are willing to pay more to have the timing of the receipt of a cash prize accelerated from tomorrow to today, than from two days from now to tomorrow (Loewenstein and Prelec, 1991). The implication of hyperbolic discounting for mitigation decisions is that we are asking residents to invest a tangible fixed sum now to achieve a future

benefit that we instinctively undervalue—and one that we, paradoxically, hope never to see at all. The effect of placing too much weight on immediate considerations is that the upfront costs of mitigation will loom disproportionately large relative to the delayed expected benefits in losses over time.

There is extensive evidence that residents in hazard-prone areas do not undertake loss-prevention measures voluntarily. A 1974 survey of more than 1,000 California homeowners in earthquake-prone areas revealed that only 12 percent of the respondents had adopted any protective measure (Kunreuther et al., 1978). Fifteen years later, there was little change despite the increased public awareness of the earthquake hazard. In a 1989 survey of 3,500 homeowners in four California counties at risk from earthquakes, only 5 to 9 percent of the respondents in these areas reported adopting any loss reduction measures. Palm et al. (1990), Burby et al. (1988) and Laska (1991) have found a similar reluctance by residents in flood-prone areas to invest in mitigation measures.

In the case of flood damage, Burby (2006) provides compelling evidence that actions taken by the federal government, such as constructing levees, make residents feel safe, when in fact they are still in harm's way for catastrophes should the levee be breached or overtopped. This problem is reinforced by local public officials who do not enforce building codes and/or impose land-use regulations to restrict development in high hazard areas. If developers do not design homes to be resistant to disasters and individuals do not voluntarily adopt mitigation measures, one can expect large scale losses following a catastrophic event, as evidenced by the property damage to New Orleans caused by Hurricane Katrina.

Even after the devastating 2004 and 2005 hurricane seasons, a large number of residents had still not invested in relatively inexpensive loss-reduction measures with respect to their property, nor had they undertaken emergency preparedness measures. A survey of 1,100 adults living along the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts undertaken in May 2006 revealed that 83 percent of the responders had taken no steps to fortify their home, 68 percent had no hurricane survival kit and 60 percent had no family disaster plan. (Goodnough, 2006). The fact that homeowners do not necessarily invest in cost-effective mitigation measures nor purchase adequate insurance coverage on their own if not required to do so, should not simply be considered irrational. As we just discussed, people might have their own reasons for not taking these actions until after the next disaster occurs. We thus turn to the need for long-term contracts to address these issues.

## **5. A New Concept: The Development of Long-Term Insurance Contracts**

We propose moving from the standard one-year insurance contracts for homeowners' and flood insurance for residential properties to long-term insurance ("LTI" hereafter) so as to encourage property owners to invest in cost-effective mitigation measures.<sup>12</sup> In the case of homeowners coverage (which includes protection against the effects of wind damage, but not flood losses), some insurers have recently restricted the sale of new homeowners' policies in hurricane prone areas. Policyholders cannot help but worry that their existing coverage might be subject to unexpected cancellation or very significant premium increases, particularly if there is severe hurricane damage in the near future.

---

<sup>12</sup> This section draws heavily on Jaffee, Kunreuther and Michel-Kerjan (2008).

***Need for Long-Term Insurance*** Short-term insurance policies foster significant social costs. Evidence from recent disasters reveals that consumers who fail to adequately protect their home or even insure at all, create a welfare cost to themselves and a possible cost to all taxpayers in the form of government disaster assistance. Under the current U.S. system, the governor of the state(s) can request that the president declare a “major disaster” and offer special assistance if the damage is severe enough. The number of presidential disaster declarations has dramatically increased over the past 50 years: there had been 162 during the period 1955-1965, 282 during 1966 to 1975, 319 from 1986 to 1995, and 545 from 1996 to 2005 (Michel-Kerjan, 2008).

The development of LTI should also encourage individuals to invest in cost-effective mitigation measures. As pointed out above, many homeowners do not invest in such measures due to myopia and budget constraints. They are unwilling to incur the high upfront cost associated with these investments relative to the small premium discount they would receive the following year which reflects the expected reduction in annual insured losses (Kunreuther, Meyer and Michel-Kerjan, 2009). If an LTI policy were coupled with a long-term home improvement loan tied to the mortgage, the reduction in insurance premiums would exceed the annual loan payment. The social welfare benefits of LTI coupled with long-term mitigation loans over N years could be significant: there will be less damage to property, reduction in costs of protection against catastrophic losses by insurers, more secure mortgages and lower costs to the government for disaster assistance.

***Why Does a Market for Long-Term Insurance Not Exist Today?*** In his seminal work on uncertainty and welfare economics, Kenneth Arrow defined “the absence of marketability for an action which is identifiable, technologically possible and capable of influencing some individuals’ welfare (...) as a failure of the existing market to provide a means whereby the services can be both offered and demanded upon the payment of a price.” (Arrow, 1963). Here we shall discuss several factors which have contributed to the non-marketability of LTI for protecting homeowners’ property against losses from fire, theft and large-scale natural disasters. We discuss elements which affect both the supply and demand sides.

***Supply Side.*** Today, due to political pressure, insurance rates are frequently restricted to be artificially low in hazard-prone areas, as illustrated by Florida’s actions in recent years. The result is that the risks most subject to catastrophic losses also become the most unattractive for insurers to market. A second stumbling block, derived from premium regulation, is that insurers are unclear as to how much they will be allowed to charge in the future. Uncertainty regarding costs of capital and changes in risk over time may also deter insurers from providing long-term insurance. In principle, of course, insurers could add a component in their premiums to account for the costs created by these factors. The problem is that the insurance regulator, presumed to be representing consumers’ interests, may not allow these costs to be embedded in the approved premiums. Furthermore, it is unclear what the voluntary demand for coverage will be, given the resulting premiums. In a real sense, a new and less intrusive format for government regulation of insurance markets may be required if the private sector is to be successful in dealing with time-varying risks and capital costs.

Insurers might also be concerned about possible changes in the level of risk over time. For example, global warming could trigger more intense weather-related disasters, and/or local environmental degradation might change the risk landscape in the next several decades. One way to address this concern would be to have renegotiable contracts every X years based on new

information validated by the scientific community in much the same way that there are renegotiable loans with adjustable rates.

*Demand Side.* Some homeowners may worry about the financial solvency of their insurer over a long period, particularly if they have the feeling they would be locked-in if they sign an LTI contract. Consumers might also fear being overcharged if insurers set premiums that reflect the uncertainty associated with long-term risks. Furthermore, those who have not suffered a loss for 10 years but have a 25-year LTI may feel that the premiums are unfairly priced. It is thus essential that the design of an LTI contract anticipates these concerns and be transparent to the policyholder.

***Developing an LTI Policy.*** Jaffee, Kunreuther and Michel-Kerjan (2008) have developed a simple two-period model in a competitive market setting where premiums reflect risk to compare the expected benefits of annual contracts versus LTI. The authors show that an LTI policy reduces the marketing costs for insurers compared with 1-period policies, and also reduces the search costs to the consumer if their insurer decides to cancel its policy at the end of period 1. If one permits the policyholder to cancel an LTI policy at the end of period 1 if he learns that the cost of a 1-period policy is sufficiently low to justify paying a cancellation cost ( $C$ ), then it is always optimal for the insurer to offer an LTI policy, and for a consumer to purchase one. The insurer will set  $C$  at a level which enables it break even on those policies that are canceled before the maturity date. We should note that if one is going to develop any type of LTI policy that would be marketed by the private sector, then premiums need to reflect risk (Principle 1). By giving insurers the freedom to charge prices that enable them to break even, they will have incentives to develop new products. Under the current state regulatory arrangements where many insurance commissioners have limited insurers' ability to charge risk-based premiums in hazard-prone areas, no insurance company would even entertain the possibility of marketing an LTI policy. They would be concerned that the regulator would clamp down on them now or in the future regarding what price they could charge, so that a long-term contract would be infeasible from a financial point of view.

## **6. A Natural Candidate for Long-Term Insurance: Flood Insurance through the NFIP**

Given the existing tension between state insurance regulators and the insurance industry, we feel that it is best politically to introduce LTI by focusing on flood insurance since this coverage is provided by the federal government.<sup>13</sup> The National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) was created in 1968 as a result of the refusal by insurers to cover this risk because they viewed it as uninsurable. In 2007, the NFIP sold over 5.5 million policies (compared to 2.5 million in 1992) and covered over \$1.1 trillion in assets (compared to only \$237 billion in 1992). These figures were stable in 2008. Given that the NFIP is up for renewal in Congress in September 2009, there may be a window for change in the coming months.

It would be useful to consider whether one could make flood insurance policies long-term by tying them to mortgages. By instituting such a program, insurance would be connected directly to the property, rather than to the homeowner. One might also consider *requiring* everyone in flood-prone areas to take out the insurance, just as those who own a car are required

---

<sup>13</sup> For more details on the National Flood Insurance Program see the paper by Mark Brown prepared for this conference.

to take out automobile insurance today whether or not they are financing the purchase of their car. If a homeowner moved to another location, the flood insurance policy would remain with the property.

***Why Have a Long-Term Flood Insurance Policy?*** A long-term flood insurance program would offer homeowners currently residing in flood-prone areas a fixed rate for a fixed period of time (for example, 5, 10 or 20 years). If the homeowner moved away from the area before the end of the policy period, then the insurance policy would automatically be transferred to the new property owner at the same rate. For those homeowners who were being charged subsidized rates because their homes were constructed prior to the time that their community joined the NFIP, these rates would be maintained for the length of the policy period. For homeowners who constructed homes after the date that their community joined the program, their rates would be actuarially based.

There are a number of reasons why such a long-term flood insurance policy would be a great improvement over the current annual policies from the perspective of the relevant stakeholders: homeowners, FEMA, banks and financial institutions and the general taxpayer. By fixing flood insurance rates at a fixed price, homeowners would be provided with financial stability. They would also have knowledge that they are protected against water damage from floods and hurricanes. This would reduce the legal problems that have stemmed from recent hurricanes (Florida hurricanes of 2004, Katrina, Ike). Homeowners would not have to argue that the losses were due to wind so they could collect on their homeowners' policy.

Long-term flood insurance would also assure the spread of risk within the program since most homeowners in flood-prone areas would be covered. If flood insurance were required for all homeowners residing in hazard-prone areas, then there would be even a larger spread of risk. This would provide much needed financial revenue for the program over time by having a much larger policy base than is currently available.

Long-term policies would prevent individuals from cancelling their policies after they have not experienced a flood for several years. Presently, some individuals cancel their policies, even if they are required to purchase the policy as a condition for a federally insured mortgage. The banks and financial institutions have often not enforced this regulation because few of them have been fined and/or the mortgages are transferred to banks in non-flood prone regions of the country that have not focused on either the flood hazard risk or the requirement that homeowners may have to purchase this coverage. Consider the flood in August 1998 that damaged property in northern Vermont. Of the 1549 victims of this disaster, FEMA found 84 percent of the homeowners in Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHAs) did not have insurance, even though 45 percent of these individuals were required to purchase this coverage. (Tobin and Calfee, 2005)

If long-term loans for mitigation were offered by banks, then individuals with long-term flood insurance policies would be encouraged to invest in cost-effective risk reduction measures. To highlight this point, consider the following simple example. Suppose a property owner could invest \$1,500 to flood proof his home so as to reduce the water damage by \$30,000 from a future flood or hurricane with an annual probability of 1 in 100. The NFIP should be willing to reduce the annual premium by \$300 (that is,  $1/100 \times \$30,000$ ) to reflect the lower expected losses that would occur if a flood or hurricane hit the area in which the policyholder was residing. If the house was expected to last for 10 or more years, the net present value of the expected benefit of

investing in this measure would exceed the upfront cost at an annual discount rate as high as 15 percent.

Today, many property owners would be reluctant to incur the \$1,500 expenditure, because they would get only \$300 back next year and are likely to only consider the benefits over the next few years when making their decisions. If they underweight the future, the expected discounted benefits would likely be less than the \$1,500 upfront costs. In addition, budget constraints could discourage them from investing in the mitigation measure. Other considerations would also play a role in a family's decision not to invest in these measures. The family may not be certain how long they will reside in the house and/or whether their insurer would reward them again when their policy is renewed. There may also be a failure to appreciate the interdependencies associated with floods, earthquakes and other disasters. More specifically, by investing in mitigation measures, one will not only reduce the potential losses to one's own property but alleviate damage to neighboring structures.

If a 20 year flood insurance policy were tied to the property, then the homeowner could take out a 20-year \$1,500 home improvement loan linked to the mortgage at an annual interest rate of 10 percent, resulting in payments of \$145 per year. If the insurance premium was reduced by \$300, the savings to the homeowner each year would be \$155. Alternatively, this loan could be incorporated as part of the mortgage at even a lower interest rate than 10 percent.

Long-term insurance and mitigation loans would constitute new financial products. A bank would have a financial incentive to provide this type of loan, since it is now better protected against a catastrophic loss to the property, and the NFIP knows that its potential loss from a major disaster is reduced. Moreover, the general public will now be less likely to have large amounts of their tax dollars going for disaster relief. Indeed, prior to the 2005 hurricane season, which inflicted nearly \$18 billion in flood claims, the NFIP had a cumulative deficit of about \$3 billion after 37 years of operation (Michel-Kerjan and Kousky, 2009). A win-win-win-win situation for all!

## **7. Conclusion**

Since the 1990s, we have witnessed a series of large-scale catastrophes that have inflicted historical economic and insured losses. Half of the 20 most costly insured catastrophes between 1970 and 2007 occurred since 2001, and all were natural disasters except for the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The United States has been particularly challenged because nine of these 20 disasters for insurance occurred in this country. The growing concentration of population and structures in high-risk areas, combined with the potential consequences of global warming, are likely to lead to even more devastating catastrophes in the coming years unless cost-effective risk reduction measures are put in place.

The challenge facing the United States, and many other countries, is how to encourage residents and businesses to invest in loss-reduction measures and insurance in advance of a disaster so as to avoid the large-scale governmental disaster relief that will be provided after a catastrophe occurs. Indeed, even when risk reduction measures are available and are cost-effective, many people are still not investing in them. Following a disaster government agencies provide assistance to the area. We term this the *natural disaster syndrome*.

The past few years have provided additional empirical evidence supporting the natural disaster syndrome. In the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina many victims suffered severe losses from flooding because they had not mitigated their homes and did not have flood insurance to cover the resulting damage. As a result, an unprecedented level of federal disaster assistance was provided to these victims and the affected communities. There are many reasons why those in harm's way have not undertaken protective measures in advance of disaster. Many individuals believe that the event will not happen to them. In the case of New Orleans, some residents may have felt that they were fully protected by flood control measures such as the levees.<sup>14</sup> This has led to increased development in hazard-prone areas without appropriate land-use regulations and well-enforced building codes. In addition, budget constraints and short time horizons may limit people's ability and interest to invest in hazard mitigation measures and to purchase insurance. Such a dynamic has been observed in many countries around the world.

We propose a new initiative that could address these issues: long-term insurance contracts coupled with long-term loans for encouraging the adoption of cost-effective mitigation measures and providing stability to homeowners. Given the benefits and potential difficulties in implementing such a program, we conclude that flood insurance would be a natural candidate for such a long-term program. Given that the NFIP is up for renewal in September 2009, there may be a political will to develop more effective solutions.

As the 2007 Economic Report of the President stated, "Insurance plays a vital role in America's economy by helping households and businesses manage risks. (...) When insurance prices reflect underlying economic costs they can encourage a more efficient allocation of resources. Efforts to keep premiums for insurance against catastrophe hazards artificially low, whether through regulation or through subsidized government programs, can encourage excessively risky behavior on the part of those who might be affected by future catastrophes." It is fair to say that two years after its publication, this federal will has not been translated into state and local actions.

There is an opportunity for the Obama Administration and the U.S. Congress to take steps now to reduce these losses and protect the Nation against extreme events in a more systematic way than we have to date. We need a more coherent national strategy for managing these risks in a new era of catastrophes.

---

<sup>14</sup> FEMA clearly thought that the levees would provide this protection. Otherwise they would have designated the Lower Ninth Ward as a hazard-prone area and residents would have been eligible for flood insurance.

## REFERENCES

- Association of British Insurers (ABI) (2005), "Financial Risks of Climate Change," June 2005.
- Arrow, K. (1963), "Uncertainty and the Welfare Economics of Medical Care," *American Economic Review*, 53(5):941-973
- Burby, R. (2006), "Hurricane Katrina and the Paradoxes of Government Disaster Policy: Bringing About Wise Governmental Decisions for Hazardous Areas" *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 604: 171-191
- Burby, R., S. Bollens, E. Kaiser, D. Mullan and J. Sheaffer (1988), *Cities Under Water: A Comparative Evaluation of Ten Cities' Efforts to Manage Floodplain Land Use*. Boulder, CO: Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado.
- Crossett, K.M., T.J. Culliton, P.C. Wiley, and T.R. Goodspeed (2004), "Population Trends Along the Coastal United States: 1980-2008", National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), National Ocean Service, Special projects: Silver Spring, MD.
- Crowell, M., S. Edelman, K. Coulton and S. McAfee (2007), "How many People Live in Coastal Areas?" *Journal of Coastal Research*, 23 (5), iii-vi.
- Financial Services Roundtable (2007), *Blue Ribbon Commission on Mega-Catastrophes Comprehensive Report*, Chapter 2.
- Goodnough, A. (2006), "As Hurricane Season Looms, State Aim to Scare," *The New York Times*, May 31.
- Grossi, P. and H. Kunreuther (eds.) (2005), *Catastrophe Modeling: A New Approach to Managing Risk*. New York: Springer.
- Jaffee, D., H. Kunreuther, and E. Michel-Kerjan (2008), "Long Term Insurance (LTI) for Addressing Catastrophic Market Failure", National Bureau of Economic Research, NBER working paper 14210, Cambridge, MA.
- Kunreuther, H. et al. (1978), *Disaster Insurance Protection: Public Policy Lessons*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Kunreuther, H. (1996), "Mitigating disaster losses through insurance," *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 12: 171-187.
- Kunreuther, H., R.J. Meyer and E. Michel-Kerjan (2009), "Strategies for Better Protection against Catastrophic Risks", in E. Shafir (ed), *Behavioral Foundations of Policy*, Princeton University Press.
- Kunreuther, H., and E. Michel-Kerjan (2009), *At War with the Weather: Managing Large-Scale Risks in a New Era of Catastrophes*. New York: MIT Press.
- Kunreuther, H. and E. Michel-Kerjan (2004), "Policy Watch: Terrorism Risk Insurance in the United States", *Journal of Economics Perspectives*, 18 (4).
- Kunreuther, H., N. Novemsky and D. Kahneman (2001), "Making Low Probabilities Useful." *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 23:103-120.
- Laska, S.B. (1991). *Floodproof Retrofitting: Homeowner Self-Protective Behavior*. Boulder, CO: Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado.
- Loewenstein, G. and D. Prelec (1991), "Negative Time Preference," *American Economic Review*, Vol. 81(2), pages 347-52, May.

- Michel-Kerjan, E., P. Raschky and H. Kunreuther (2009), “Corporate Demand for Property and Terrorism Insurance in the U.S.: An Empirical Analysis”, Wharton Risk Center Working Paper.
- Michel-Kerjan, E. (2008), “Disasters and Public Policy: Can Market Lessons Help Address Government Failures,” proceedings of the 99th National Tax Association Conference, Boston, MA, *National Tax Journal*.
- Michel-Kerjan, E. and C. Kousky (2009), “Come Rain or Shine: Evidence on Flood Insurance Purchases in Florida,” Joint Working Paper, The Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania and Resources for the Future.
- Michel-Kerjan, E. and B. Pedell (2006), “How Does the Corporate World Cope With Mega-Terrorism? Puzzling Evidence from Terrorism Insurance Markets,” *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, 18 (4), 61-75.
- Mills, E. and E. Lecomte (2006), “From Risk To Opportunity: How Insurers Can Proactively and Profitably Manage Climate Change,” *Ceres*, August 2006.
- Munich Re. (2008). “Catastrophe Figures for 2008 Confirm That Climate Agreement Is Urgently Needed.” December 29.
- Palm, R., M. Hodgson, R.D. Blanchard and D. Lyons (1990), *Earthquake Insurance in California: Environmental Policy and Individual Decision Making*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Pielke, R. Jr, J. Gratz, C. Landsea, D. Collins, M. Saunders, and R. Musulin (2008), “Normalized Hurricane Damage in the United States: 1900–2005”, *Natural Hazard Review*, February 2008.
- Stern Review (2006), *The Economics of Climate Change*, H.M. Treasury, December, and Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2007), *Climate Change 2007*, January.
- Swiss Re (2008), “Preliminary Swiss Re sigma estimates that over 238 000 people were killed by catastrophes in 2008, insured losses soar to USD 50 billion,” December 18.
- Tobin, R. and C. Calfee (2005), “The National Flood Insurance Program’s Mandatory Purchase Requirement: Policies, Processes, and Stakeholders” American Institutes for Research, Washington, D.C.
- Wharton Risk Center (2005), *TRIA and Beyond: Terrorism Risk Financing in the U.S.*, (Philadelphia: The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania).
- White House Council of Economic Advisors (2007), *Economic Report of the President*. Washington, D.C.