Insurance losses of electric vehicles and their conventional counterparts while adjusting for mileage

Summary

Unlike conventional and hybrid vehicles, electric vehicles are powered exclusively by electricity stored in batteries. In the United States, the number of electric vehicles on the road has increased significantly since the introduction of the Tesla Roadster in 2008, and this growth is projected to continue. Therefore, it is important to understand how the insurance losses of electric vehicles differ from conventional vehicles.

The current study is an update of previous Highway Loss Data Institute (HLDI) studies on insurance losses for electric vehicles in 2015, 2016, and 2017. The current study expands on the prior studies by looking at injury coverages for the first time and exploring the differences and changes in claim severities in more detail. The prior study (HLDI, 2017) found collision and property damage liability (PDL) claim frequencies for electric vehicles to be significantly lower than their conventional counterparts, while claim severity tended to be higher. However, the higher claim severity associated with electric vehicles from the earlier studies (HLDI, 2015; 2016) has attenuated over time.

This analysis compares insurance losses for electric vehicles with their conventional counterparts under collision, PDL, and injury-related coverages. Claim frequencies were calculated both with and without miles per day as a control. HLDI obtained the mileage information through a cooperative agreement with CARFAX, a unit of IHS Markit. In comparison to the 2017 bulletin, this study adds one new vehicle pair (2019–20 Hyundai Kona), two additional calendar years (2018–19), and more than twice the exposure.

The results of the current study (shown below) are consistent with the findings of the prior research. Electric vehicles continue to show significantly lower collision and PDL claim frequencies compared with their conventional counterparts. The increases in collision and PDL claim severity associated with electric vehicles have continued to attenuate, with the collision result no longer statistically significant. Electric vehicles were also associated with lower claim frequencies under all three injury coverages.

Estimated insurance losses of electric vehicles versus conventional counterparts, controlling for mileage

HLDI will continue to monitor the changing landscape of electric vehicles. Based on vehicle history reports from CARFAX, the electric vehicle series in this analysis were driven 39 percent fewer miles per day than their conventional counterparts. However, when mileage was included in the model, the magnitude of the claim frequency and overall loss benefits declined somewhat but remained significant. This indicates that the lower losses for electric vehicles are due only partly to fewer exposure miles.

Note that this report does not include information on Tesla losses because Tesla has no conventionally-powered counterpart; previous HLDI analyses have indicated that Tesla losses are higher than other large luxury vehicles with conventional gas engines, and that difference increases when adjusted for exposure miles.
Introduction

The first all-electric vehicle available for sale to consumers in the United States was the 2008 Tesla Roadster electric convertible. Since then, the number of all-electric vehicles in the registered vehicle fleet, while still very small, has been growing rapidly. Figure 1 shows the rise of electric vehicles in the vehicle fleet since 2009, as a proportion of the registered vehicle fleet. In 2009, there were only around 500 electric vehicles registered in the fleet and by 2020, there were more than 1 million (less that 0.4 percent of the total registered vehicle fleet).

Figure 1: Proportion of electric vehicles in the registered vehicle fleet by calendar year

HLDI has published the loss experience of electric cars in direct comparison with their nonelectric counterparts in 2015, 2016, and 2017. This bulletin is similar to the prior analyses and continues to include results adjusted for miles traveled. Results for the corresponding conventional versions were included for comparison. A conventional counterpart shares the same platform and nameplate with its electric version and is produced by the same manufacturer. Only true electric vehicles were included in this study. The Chevrolet Volt, which can be powered by electricity or gasoline (when the battery is depleted), was not included. Other all-electric vehicles, such as the Chevrolet Bolt, Nissan Leaf, and Tesla vehicles, were also not included in the analysis, as they have no direct gasoline-powered counterparts.

Method

Insurance data

Automobile insurance covers damage to vehicles and property in crashes plus injuries to the people involved in the crashes. Different insurance coverages pay for vehicle damage versus injuries, and different coverages may apply depending on who is at fault. This study is based on collision, property damage liability (PDL), bodily injury (BI) liability, personal injury protection (PIP), and medical payment (MedPay) coverage data.

Collision coverage insures against physical damage to a driver’s vehicle sustained in a crash with an object or other vehicle, generally when the driver is at fault. PDL coverage insures against vehicle damage that at-fault drivers cause to other people’s vehicles and property in crashes. This coverage exists in all states except Michigan, where vehicle damage is covered on a no-fault basis (each insured vehicle pays for its own damage in a crash, regardless of who is at fault).

Coverage of injuries is more complex. Bodily injury (BI) liability coverage insures against medical, hospital, and other expenses for injuries that at-fault drivers inflict on occupants of other vehicles or others on the road; although motorists in most states may have BI liability coverage, this information was only analyzed for the 33 states with traditional tort insurance systems where the at-fault driver has first obligation to pay for injuries. MedPay coverage also is sold in the 33 states with traditional tort insurance systems and covers injuries to insured drivers and the passengers in their vehicles, but not injuries to people in other vehicles involved in the crash. The 17 other states without traditional tort insurance systems employ no-fault injury systems where PIP coverage pays up to a specified amount...
for injuries to occupants of involved-insured vehicles, regardless of who is at fault in a collision. The District of Columbia has a hybrid insurance system for injuries and was excluded from each injury analysis.

Exposure is measured in insured vehicle years. An insured vehicle year is equivalent to one vehicle insured for one year, two vehicles insured for six months, etc. Comprehensive coverage was not included in this analysis. Injury-related coverages were included in this analysis for the first time. Due to the small number of claims associated with the electric vehicles under injury coverages, only the frequencies for all claims were analyzed in this study.

**Mileage data**

The linking of mileage data and HLDI insurance data was made possible through a cooperative agreement with CARFAX. Vehicle identification numbers (VINs) from the HLDI database were matched to odometer readings from CARFAX. Odometer readings came from multiple sources, including title transfers, yearly inspections, and routine maintenance service. The frequency of odometer readings varied widely. Some vehicles had just one or two odometer readings, while others had numerous readings (e.g., every oil change and state inspection).

Miles per day (MPD) was computed for each day of exposure by taking the ratio of the increase in miles from two consecutive odometer readings to the number of days between the two readings. When more than one mileage reading was available, MPD was calculated for each pair. For example, the days between the first and second mileage readings could be assigned different MPD than the days between the second and third mileage readings. The different daily averages were assigned to the corresponding periods of matching collision coverage.

**Vehicles studied**

The vehicles included in this study were electric vehicles and their exact conventional counterparts. The conventional counterpart had to have a gasoline-powered engine and the same platform and nameplate as the electric vehicle. Model years were limited to those where both the electric and conventional versions were available. A total of nine vehicle pairs were included, with model years ranging from 2012 to 2020. These vehicle pairs are listed in Table 1. One vehicle pair was added to this study: the Hyundai Kona.

The earlier analyses (HLDI, 2015, 2016, 2017) included the 2011 BMW 1 series and 2011 Smart ForTwo vehicles. The electric versions of both these vehicles were available as lease only. As a larger pool of electric vehicles with conventional counterparts are now available to study, both the 2011 BMW and Smart ForTwo were excluded from the current analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model years</th>
<th>Make</th>
<th>Electric series</th>
<th>Conventional series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012–14</td>
<td>Toyota</td>
<td>RAV4 EV electric 5dr 2WD</td>
<td>RAV4 4dr 2WD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–18</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Focus electric 5dr</td>
<td>Focus 5dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013–17</td>
<td>Smart</td>
<td>Electric driver 2dr</td>
<td>ForTwo 2dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013–19</td>
<td>Fiat</td>
<td>500 electric 2dr</td>
<td>500 2dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013–15, 17</td>
<td>Smart</td>
<td>Electric drive convertible</td>
<td>ForTwo convertible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014–16</td>
<td>Chevrolet</td>
<td>Spark EV electric 5dr</td>
<td>Spark 5dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015–19</td>
<td>Volkswagen</td>
<td>E-Golf electric 4dr</td>
<td>Golf 4dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016–19</td>
<td>Kia</td>
<td>Soul electric station wagon</td>
<td>Soul station wagon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019–20</td>
<td>Hyundai</td>
<td>Kona electric 4dr</td>
<td>Kona 4dr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis methods

Regression analysis was used to quantify the difference between the electric vehicles and their conventional counterparts while controlling for other covariates. Estimates for claim frequency, claim severity, and overall losses are presented for collision and PDL coverage types. The frequencies for all claims of BI, PIP, and MedPay coverages are also reported. MPD was included in the analyses for claim frequencies, and thus overall losses. Average MPD was included in all models, except for the claim severity models. Prior HLDI research (2016c) found much higher average claim severity for vehicles with low average MPD than those with moderate-to-high average MPD. The analysis indicated that the more costly claims were responsible for lower average MPD—low MPD did not cause higher dollar claims. We hypothesized that the crashes that result in high severity claims cause extensive damage associated with increased repair times. Those increased repair times keep vehicles off of the road and decrease the amount of miles that they travel. Due to this phenomenon, all HLDI studies only add average MPD to the claim frequency control variables and not to the claim severity control variables.

HLDI normally separates vehicles of the same nameplate but with conventional or electric engines into different series. For example, the Ford Focus five-door is a separate vehicle series from the Ford Focus electric five-door series. For this analysis, the conventional and electric counterparts with the same nameplate were combined into one series, the Ford Focus five-door. Combining these into a single series allowed for the regression model to control for factors common to both the conventional and electric versions. Based on the model year and the combined series, a single variable called SERIESMY was created for inclusion in the regression model. Effectively, this variable controlled for the variation caused by vehicle design changes that occur from model year to model year.

Other covariates included calendar year, garaging state, vehicle density (number of registered vehicles per square mile), rated driver age group, rated driver gender, rated driver marital status, deductible range (collision only), and risk. Categories with the largest exposure were assigned as the reference category as follows: engine = conventional, vehicle model year and series = 2012 Ford Focus 5dr, miles driven per day = 40–49.9, rated driver age group = 50–59, risk = standard, state = California, rated driver gender = female, rated driver marital status = married, deductible range = $251–500, density = 1,000+, and calendar year = 2018.

Claim frequency was modeled using a Poisson distribution, and claim severity was modeled using a Gamma distribution. Both models used a logarithmic link function. Estimates for overall losses for collision and PDL were derived from the claim frequency and claim severity models. Estimates for claim frequency are presented for collision, PDL, BI liability, PIP, and MedPay coverage types. The frequencies of BI liability, PIP, and MedPay claims are for all claims, including those that have been paid and those for which money has been set aside for possible payment in the future, known as claims with reserves. For space reasons, illustrative full regression results for collision claim frequency with mileage are shown in the Appendix.

To further simplify the presentation here, the exponent of the parameter estimate was calculated, 1 was subtracted, and the results multiplied by 100. The resulting number corresponds to the effect of a given model variable on a loss measure. For example, the estimate of collision claim frequency with mileage for electric vehicles was −0.2222; thus, collision claim frequency is expected to be 20 percent lower than that of their conventional counterparts ((exp(−0.2222)−1) × 100 = −20).
Table 2 shows the exposure of the electric series and their conventional counterparts, sorted by conventional exposure in descending order. Electric series exposure ranged from 1 percent to 17 percent. The Ford Focus pair had the highest exposure (over 2 million years combined). Note that the model years applied for each pair were not identical; thus, exposure across the series pairs should not be compared directly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electric exposure</th>
<th>Conventional exposure</th>
<th>Percent electric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ford Focus 5dr</td>
<td>24,487</td>
<td>1,985,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kia Soul</td>
<td>13,332</td>
<td>1,246,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyota Rav4</td>
<td>8,771</td>
<td>974,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiat 500 2dr</td>
<td>61,290</td>
<td>330,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevrolet Spark 5dr</td>
<td>20,959</td>
<td>306,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volkswagen Golf</td>
<td>33,122</td>
<td>162,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart ForTwo 2dr</td>
<td>13,908</td>
<td>97,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyundai Kona 4dr</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>15,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart ForTwo Convertible</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>8,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>178,271</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,127,842</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 compares the exposure weighted average base price, curb weight, and miles per day (MPD) of the electric series with their conventional counterparts. The weights in the average were proportional to the exposure of each record in the dataset. Vehicles with high exposure contribute more than vehicles with low exposure in the final average results. For analyses using the current exposure-weighted average method, the base price of electric vehicles was 62 percent higher than their conventional counterparts. The curb weight of electric vehicles was 9 percent higher than their conventional counterparts, and the MPD of electric vehicles was 39 percent lower than their conventional counterparts.

Figure 2: Exposure-weighted base price, curb weight, and mileage, electric versus conventional counterparts
Figure 3 compares the exposure distribution of miles per day (MPD) between electric vehicles and their conventional counterparts when MPD is known. The proportion of exposure for vehicles with unknown or invalid MPD was higher for electric vehicles compared with their conventional counterparts (35 percent vs 28 percent). This is likely due to electric vehicles not needing oil changes, and therefore they are less likely to have CARFAX data compared with conventional vehicles. Among vehicles with known MPD, 82 percent of the electric vehicle exposure was for vehicles averaging fewer than 30 MPD compared with only 44 percent of the exposure for conventional vehicles. The availability of charging stations and limited battery range can make electric vehicles less suitable for longer trips.

### Results

**Estimated insurance losses for studied coverages**

Figure 4 shows the estimated collision and PDL losses for the electric series versus their conventional counterparts. When controlling for mileage, electric vehicles were estimated to have lower collision claim frequency (−20 percent) and overall losses (−19 percent). Claim severity does not take mileage into account and resulted in an insignificant 1 percent increase for collision.

For PDL, a similar pattern emerged, showing claim frequency and overall loss reductions of 17 percent and 14 percent, respectively, taking mileage into account. Claim severity showed a 3 percent increase. All estimates for both collision and PDL were statistically significant except for collision claim severity.
Table 3 shows a summary of the results for the collision and PDL coverage types. All results are statistically significant, except for collision claim severity. This table compares the claim frequency and overall loss results with and without mileage as well as the uncontrolled severity estimates. Claim frequencies and overall losses for the electric vehicles were lower than their conventional counterparts, but once mileage was included in the model, the reductions were not as large.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Claim frequency not controlling for mileage</th>
<th>Claim frequency controlling for mileage</th>
<th>Percent difference</th>
<th>Claim severity not controlling for mileage</th>
<th>Overall losses not controlling for mileage</th>
<th>Overall losses controlling for mileage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collision</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property damage liability</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5 shows the estimated injury coverage claim frequencies for electric vehicles versus their conventional counterparts. When controlling for mileage, electric vehicles were estimated to have lower claim frequencies for BI, PIP, and MedPay with 22 percent, 40 percent, and 41 percent, respectively. All these results were statistically significant. Due to the small number of claims associated with the electric vehicles under injury coverages, only the frequency for all claims were analyzed here.

**Figure 5: Estimated injury coverage claim frequencies for electric vehicles versus conventional counterparts, controlling for mileage**
In 2017, HLDI analyzed electric vehicles and their conventional counterparts, taking mileage into account for claim frequency and overall losses. Figures 6–7 compare the results from the 2017 report with the current report for collision and PDL coverages (HLDI, 2017). For collision, the largest change was in claim severity, which showed a significant 7 percent increase in the 2017 report, and is now a much smaller, insignificant, 1 percent increase. PDL claim severity showed a similar trend, declining from an 8 percent increase to only a 3 percent increase. Both collision and PDL claim frequency results showed slight attenuation but remained consistent with the prior study. Consequently, overall losses for both coverages showed a slightly larger reduction when compared with prior results.
Discussion

HLDI’s first study (2015) on electric vehicles and their conventional counterparts found that electric vehicles were associated with fewer collision and PDL claims, but increased collision and PDL claim severity. Although the frequency results have remained consistent over time, the increases in claim severity for both collision and PDL have attenuated, as shown in Figure 8 (collision) and Figure 9 (PDL). Figure 8 shows the estimated (modeled) collision losses for electric vehicles and their counterparts by adding 1 calendar year at a time starting from 2016. Each year, the increase in collision claim severity diminished, until it reached 1 percent in the current report. This result is not statistically significant. Claim frequency results remained consistent over time. The overall losses had a slightly larger reduction each year, due mainly to the change in claim severity.

Figure 8: Estimated collision losses over time, electric vehicles versus conventional counterparts, controlling for mileage

Figure 9 shows the estimated (modeled) PDL losses for electric vehicles and their counterparts by adding 1 calendar year at a time starting from 2016. The pattern for PDL losses was similar to collision losses, with claim frequency results remaining consistent over time while the increase in claim severity declined until it reached 3 percent in 2019.

Figure 9: Estimated PDL losses over time, electric vehicles versus conventional counterparts, controlling for mileage
Figure 10 shows the average observed collision claim severities for electric vehicles and their conventional counterparts by calendar year. In 2013, collision claim severity was over $1,300 higher for electric vehicles compared with their conventional counterparts. However, claim severity for electric vehicles steadily dropped over the next 4 years while claim severity for the conventional vehicles increased. In 2017, collision claim severity for the electric vehicles was actually lower than their conventional counterparts. Electric vehicle claim severity began increasing again in 2018 and as of 2019 were on par with their conventional counterparts.

Vehicle base price

One contributing factor to claim severity is the price of the vehicle. An exposure-weighted base price difference was calculated to present the overall change of the difference in base price over time. The base price difference between the electric vehicles and their exact conventional counterpart with the same platform and nameplate by model year was first calculated. These differences were then weighted by the total conventional and electric exposure for that model year and series in a given calendar year and then averaged.

Figure 11 shows the exposure-weighted base price difference by calendar year for electric vehicles and their conventional counterparts. The base price difference between electric and conventional vehicles has decreased since 2012. In 2012, the exposure-weighted base price difference was $21,025. In 2017, it was $16,779. Throughout the study period, the difference in base price continued to decline, reaching a difference of $16,029 in 2019.
The changes in the base price difference are the result of two factors. One is that the distribution of vehicles included in the study has changed over time. Figures 12–13 show the exposure distribution by manufacturer and calendar year for electric and conventional vehicles. In 2012, there were four vehicles in the study from Ford, Fiat, Smart, and Toyota. Over time, more makes and series were added, resulting in a larger mix of vehicles.
The other factor is that for some vehicle series, the difference between the base price of an electric vehicle and its conventional counterpart declined for newer model years, as shown in Figure 14. For example, the base price difference for the Ford Focus declined from $18,990 in the 2014 model year to $7,490 in the 2015 model year. Similarly, the price difference for the Volkswagen Golf declined from $11,775 in the 2015 model year to $7,720 in the 2016 model year. However, not all vehicle pairs experienced a reduction in their price differences. For example, the base price difference between the electric vehicles and their conventional counterparts for Kia, Fiat, and Toyota remained relatively constant.

![Figure 14: Base price difference for makes by model year, electric vehicles versus conventional counterparts](image)

These two factors explain why the difference in base price between electric vehicles and their conventional counterparts in this study have been declining over time. This may also partly explain why the difference in collision claim severity has diminished. However, although less than before, the base price for electric vehicles was still $16,029 higher than their conventional counterparts in 2019. Typically, more expensive vehicles are associated with higher collision severities (HLDI, 2016a). Thus, it is puzzling why there is no statistically significant difference in collision claim severity between electric vehicles and their conventional counterparts. Note that this study uses the base price (i.e., the MSRP of the base model with destination charges) and not sale price and, therefore, does not include the price of optional equipment or higher end trim levels. Consequently, it is possible that differences in the actual sale price between electric and conventional vehicles are much smaller.

**Exploration of collision claim severity**

Several additional analyses were conducted to try and better understand why there was no significant difference in collision claim severity for electric vehicles, despite being more expensive compared with their conventional counterparts.
Figure 15 shows the estimated (modeled) collision claim severity for electric vehicles and their conventional counterparts by make. The estimated results vary among different makes. Across manufacturers, the Fiat and Toyota electric series were associated with a significant increase in collision claim severity compared with their conventional counterparts by 5 and 14 percent, respectively, while the Volkswagen electric series was associated with a significant decrease in collision claim severity by 7 percent.

Another hypothesis investigated whether the age of the vehicle impacted the severity results. Batteries lose their effectiveness over time, so it is possible that electric vehicles depreciate faster over time compared with their conventional counterparts, which could affect collision claim severity. Figure 16 compares suggested used car prices (from Kelley Blue Book) by model year for the Fiat 500 series and displays the base price for new 2019 Fiat 500 series vehicles. The new 2019 Fiat 500 electric depreciated much faster than its conventional counterpart did as shown in the figure. For example, the brand-new 2019 Fiat 500 electric sells for $34,705. In the first year, it depreciated to $13,510, losing 61 percent of its value (based on the price for a used 2018 Fiat 500 electric). By contrast, the Fiat 500 conventional sells new for $18,735 and depreciated to $12,499 in the first year, losing only 33 percent of its value. In the next year, the Fiat 500 electric depreciated from $13,510 to $8,971 (a 36 percent drop in value), while the Fiat 500 conventional lost much less: from $12,499 to $10,410 (a 17 percent drop in value). The suggested used car prices of the Fiat electric vehicles and its conventional counterparts converged over time. At the 6-year mark, the prices were almost the same: $6,457 for the electric and $6,102 for the conventional.
Figure 17 shows the estimated (modeled) differences in collision and PDL claim severities for electric vehicles and their conventional counterparts by vehicle age group. Collision claim severity for new electric vehicles was a significant 12 percent higher compared with their conventional counterparts. However, for older vehicles, there was no significant difference. Thus, it is possible that depreciation played a role in the severity results, but more research is needed to better understand the relationship between collision claim severity, vehicle price, and depreciation. PDL claim severity was 6 percent higher for vehicles aged 1 to 2 years old and significant. Results were not significant for the other age groups, and it is unclear how the age of the striking vehicle would affect the repair costs of the struck vehicle.

Total losses may also have played a role in the severity results. A vehicle is determined to be a total loss when the estimated cost to repair it plus the salvage amount is greater than the value of the repaired vehicle. Figures 18–19 show that total losses as a percentage of all collision claims and the percentage of collision dollars paid for total losses for conventional vehicles were always higher than those for their electric vehicle counterparts. While conventional vehicles are typically less expensive, when involved in a crash, they are much more likely to be a total loss than electric vehicles.
The average payment for total losses was higher for electric vehicles than their conventional counterparts from 2013 to 2019 (Figure 20). The largest difference is in 2013, where the average payment for total losses is $32,988 for electric vehicles and $19,025 for their conventional counterparts. This difference has gradually diminished over time, declining to only a $1,810 difference between electric vehicles and their conventional counterparts in 2019. This might also help to explain why the higher collision claim severity results associated with electric vehicles has decreased over time.
Finally, the types of crashes these vehicles are involved in may also play a role. Figure 21 shows the distribution of collision claims by point of impact for electric vehicles and their conventional counterparts during calendar years 2011 to 2019. Interestingly, compared with conventional vehicles, electrics had fewer frontal claims (45 percent vs. 51 percent) and more rear claims (32 percent vs. 27 percent). Claims for frontal impacts, on average, tend to have higher severities than claims for rear impacts, as shown in Figure 22 ($5,540 in the front vs $3,092 in the rear for electric vehicles; $5,257 in the front vs. $3,298 in the rear for conventional vehicles). This could also help explain the insignificant collision claim severity result; however, it is unclear why electric vehicles would have fewer frontal and more rear impacts. Advanced driver assistance systems such as automatic emergency braking or rear cameras could affect the point-of-impact distribution, but the presence or absence of these systems on a vehicle was not known.

![Figure 21: Distribution of collision claims by point of impact for electric vehicles and their conventional counterparts, 2011–19](image)

![Figure 22: Average dollars paid by point of impact for collision coverage, electric vehicles versus conventional counterparts](image)

In summary, the differences in both collision and PDL claim severities between electric vehicles and their conventional counterparts has diminished over time. Some of this reduction may be attributable to changes in the distribution of vehicles in the study as well as price reductions for newer models of some electric vehicles. Further analyses also found that differences in claim severity diminished as the vehicles aged, conventional vehicles were more likely to be totaled, and that electric vehicles had relatively fewer frontal- and more rear-impact claims. While these new analyses may help explain the collision severity results, the mechanism through which these factors affect PDL severity remains unclear. HLDI will continue to monitor the differences and changes in claim severity and explore other contributors associated with the changes.
Limitations

While ADAS features are offered on both electric and conventional vehicles, the availability of these features varies among electric vehicles and their conventional counterparts. It is not always the case that electric vehicles have more systems available than nonelectric vehicles. The presence or absence of ADAS on the vehicles in this study was unknown, and analyses did not control for the difference in ADAS availability, which could affect the estimated results for claim frequencies and insurance losses.

Additionally, electric vehicles are typically more expensive than their conventional counterparts. The type of person who selects an electric vehicle may be different from the person who selects a conventional vehicle. While the analysis controls for several driver characteristics, there may be other uncontrolled attributes associated with the people who select electric vehicles.
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### Appendix: Illustrative regression results — collision claim frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Wald 95% confidence limits</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-8.3260</td>
<td>0.0103</td>
<td>-8.3461</td>
<td>-8.3059 659259.00</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2222</td>
<td>-19.9%</td>
<td>0.0112</td>
<td>-0.2442 -0.2002</td>
<td>392.38</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle model year and series</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Fiat 500 2dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.1073</td>
<td>-10.2%</td>
<td>0.0104</td>
<td>-0.1276 -0.0870</td>
<td>106.97</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Fiat 500 2dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0213</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>0.0196</td>
<td>-0.0598 0.0172</td>
<td>1.17 0.2786</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Fiat 500 2dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0336</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
<td>0.0133</td>
<td>-0.0597 -0.0075</td>
<td>6.35 0.0118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Fiat 500 2dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.0286</td>
<td>-0.0484 0.0636</td>
<td>0.07 0.7901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Fiat 500 2dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0236</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.0275</td>
<td>-0.0302 0.0775</td>
<td>0.74 0.3894</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Fiat 500 2dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1899</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>0.0786</td>
<td>0.0358 0.3441</td>
<td>5.83 0.0157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Fiat 500 2dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0925</td>
<td>-8.8%</td>
<td>0.2295</td>
<td>-0.5423 0.3574</td>
<td>0.16 0.6870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Ford Focus 5dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0410</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.0075</td>
<td>0.0264 0.0556</td>
<td>30.17 &lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Ford Focus 5dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0605</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>0.0072</td>
<td>0.0463 0.0747</td>
<td>69.70 &lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Ford Focus 5dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1232</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>0.0099</td>
<td>0.0108 0.1427</td>
<td>154.06 &lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Ford Focus 5dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1697</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>0.0101</td>
<td>0.1499 0.1895</td>
<td>282.62 &lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Ford Focus 5dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2056</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>0.0136</td>
<td>0.1789 0.2323</td>
<td>227.77 &lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Ford Focus 5dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2215</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>0.0183</td>
<td>0.1857 0.2573</td>
<td>147.28 &lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Smart Fortwo 2dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2688</td>
<td>-23.6%</td>
<td>0.0204</td>
<td>-0.3087 -0.2288</td>
<td>173.88 &lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Smart Fortwo 2dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2638</td>
<td>-23.2%</td>
<td>0.0332</td>
<td>-0.3289 -0.1988</td>
<td>63.20 &lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Smart Fortwo 2dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2703</td>
<td>-23.7%</td>
<td>0.0308</td>
<td>-0.3307 -0.2098</td>
<td>76.76 &lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Smart Fortwo 2dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0948</td>
<td>-9.0%</td>
<td>0.0324</td>
<td>-0.1582 -0.0313</td>
<td>8.57 0.0034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Smart Fortwo 2dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0290</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
<td>0.0798</td>
<td>-0.1854 0.1275</td>
<td>0.13 0.7166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Smart Fortwo convertible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.3717</td>
<td>-31.0%</td>
<td>0.0644</td>
<td>-0.4978 -0.2456</td>
<td>33.37 &lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Smart Fortwo convertible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0991</td>
<td>-9.4%</td>
<td>0.1100</td>
<td>-0.3146 0.1165</td>
<td>0.81 0.3678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Smart Fortwo convertible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.6496</td>
<td>-47.8%</td>
<td>0.1797</td>
<td>-1.0018 -0.2974</td>
<td>13.07 0.0003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Smart Fortwo convertible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.3008</td>
<td>-26.0%</td>
<td>0.1282</td>
<td>-0.5520 -0.0496</td>
<td>5.51 0.0189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Volkswagen Golf 4dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0155</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.0134</td>
<td>-0.0108 0.0417</td>
<td>1.34 0.2478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Volkswagen Golf 4dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0108</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>0.0166</td>
<td>0.0692 0.1344</td>
<td>37.46 &lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Volkswagen Golf 4dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0811</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>0.0191</td>
<td>0.0437 0.1185</td>
<td>18.05 &lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Volkswagen Golf 4dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1373</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>0.0456</td>
<td>0.0479 0.2267</td>
<td>9.06 0.0026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Volkswagen Golf 4dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0789</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>0.0757</td>
<td>-0.0694 0.2273</td>
<td>1.09 0.2971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Hyundai Kona 4dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0851</td>
<td>-8.2%</td>
<td>0.0343</td>
<td>-0.1523 -0.0180</td>
<td>6.17 0.0130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 Hyundai Kona 4dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2362</td>
<td>-21.0%</td>
<td>0.1488</td>
<td>-0.5278 0.0554</td>
<td>2.52 0.1124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Toyota RAV4 4dr 2WD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0376</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.0085</td>
<td>0.0209 0.0543</td>
<td>19.53 &lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Toyota RAV4 4dr 2WD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0581</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
<td>0.0083</td>
<td>-0.0744 -0.0418</td>
<td>48.76 &lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Toyota RAV4 4dr 2WD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0055</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>0.0086</td>
<td>-0.0224 0.0113</td>
<td>0.41 0.5215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Kia Soul SW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0114</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td>0.0075</td>
<td>-0.0261 0.0032</td>
<td>2.34 0.1261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Kia Soul SW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0265</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0078</td>
<td>0.0113 0.0417</td>
<td>11.66 0.0006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Kia Soul SW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1328</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>0.0117</td>
<td>0.1099 0.1557</td>
<td>128.83 &lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Kia Soul SW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1966</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>0.0131</td>
<td>0.1709 0.2223</td>
<td>224.98 &lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Kia Soul SW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2483</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>0.0177</td>
<td>0.2136 0.2830</td>
<td>196.94 &lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Chevrolet Spark 5dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1002</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>0.0100</td>
<td>0.0806 0.1197</td>
<td>100.62 &lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Chevrolet Spark 5dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1419</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>0.0134</td>
<td>0.1157 0.1681</td>
<td>112.89 &lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix: Illustrative regression results — collision claim frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Wald 95% confidence limits</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Chevrolet Spark 5dr</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1314</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>0.0151</td>
<td>0.1018 - 0.1610</td>
<td>75.56</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2012 Ford Focus 5dr</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miles driven per day</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.3001</td>
<td>-25.9%</td>
<td>0.0068</td>
<td>-0.3134 - 0.2868</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2273</td>
<td>-20.3%</td>
<td>0.0098</td>
<td>-0.2465 - 0.2080</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–19.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.1531</td>
<td>-14.4%</td>
<td>0.0070</td>
<td>-0.1668 - 0.1395</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–29.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0962</td>
<td>-9.2%</td>
<td>0.0064</td>
<td>-0.1086 - 0.0837</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0509</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
<td>0.0064</td>
<td>-0.0635 - 0.0383</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–59.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0362</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.0078</td>
<td>0.0209 - 0.0516</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–79.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1188</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>0.0080</td>
<td>0.1032 - 0.1344</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80–99.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2379</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>0.0119</td>
<td>0.2145 - 0.2613</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4263</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>0.0142</td>
<td>0.3984 - 0.4541</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rated driver age group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3551</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>0.0069</td>
<td>0.3416 - 0.3686</td>
<td>2654.95</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1666</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>0.0065</td>
<td>0.1538 - 0.1794</td>
<td>653.35</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0482</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>0.0059</td>
<td>0.0367 - 0.0597</td>
<td>67.91</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0503</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>0.0058</td>
<td>0.0389 - 0.0618</td>
<td>74.26</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0378</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
<td>0.0073</td>
<td>-0.0522 - 0.0235</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65–69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0062</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>0.0079</td>
<td>-0.0216 - 0.0092</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.4302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0943</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>0.0068</td>
<td>0.0809 - 0.1076</td>
<td>191.87</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4868</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>0.0107</td>
<td>0.4657 - 0.5078</td>
<td>2055.80</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>0.0101</td>
<td>0.0512 - 0.0908</td>
<td>49.37</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstandard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2151</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>0.0067</td>
<td>0.2019 - 0.2282</td>
<td>1027.15</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.1692</td>
<td>-15.6%</td>
<td>0.0152</td>
<td>-0.1989 - 0.1395</td>
<td>124.65</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0654</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>0.0433</td>
<td>-0.0195 - 0.1503</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.1313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.1597</td>
<td>-14.8%</td>
<td>0.0113</td>
<td>-0.1818 - 0.1375</td>
<td>199.39</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.1523</td>
<td>-14.1%</td>
<td>0.0210</td>
<td>-0.1935 - 0.1112</td>
<td>52.60</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0672</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
<td>0.0146</td>
<td>-0.0958 - 0.0386</td>
<td>21.17</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2442</td>
<td>-21.7%</td>
<td>0.0215</td>
<td>-0.2865 - 0.2020</td>
<td>128.52</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.145</td>
<td>-13.5%</td>
<td>0.0288</td>
<td>-0.2015 - 0.0886</td>
<td>25.34</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1291</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>0.0302</td>
<td>0.0699 - 0.1884</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2961</td>
<td>-25.6%</td>
<td>0.0072</td>
<td>-0.3102 - 0.2820</td>
<td>1696.18</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2199</td>
<td>-19.7%</td>
<td>0.0100</td>
<td>-0.2394 - 0.2004</td>
<td>488.18</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.1208</td>
<td>-11.4%</td>
<td>0.0201</td>
<td>-0.1602 - 0.0813</td>
<td>36.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.3203</td>
<td>-27.4%</td>
<td>0.0278</td>
<td>-0.3749 - 0.2658</td>
<td>132.38</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2563</td>
<td>-22.6%</td>
<td>0.0100</td>
<td>-0.2758 - 0.2368</td>
<td>661.47</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2163</td>
<td>-19.5%</td>
<td>0.0141</td>
<td>-0.2439 - 0.1886</td>
<td>234.58</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.289</td>
<td>-25.1%</td>
<td>0.0229</td>
<td>-0.3338 - 0.2441</td>
<td>159.35</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2692</td>
<td>-23.6%</td>
<td>0.0190</td>
<td>-0.3065 - 0.2319</td>
<td>199.77</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2795</td>
<td>-24.4%</td>
<td>0.0157</td>
<td>-0.3103 - 0.2486</td>
<td>315.83</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0452</td>
<td>-4.4%</td>
<td>0.0148</td>
<td>-0.0743 - 0.0162</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.1505</td>
<td>-14.0%</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
<td>-0.2075 - 0.0935</td>
<td>26.75</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.1176</td>
<td>-11.1%</td>
<td>0.0114</td>
<td>-0.1400 - 0.0952</td>
<td>105.88</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>Degrees of freedom</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Standard error</td>
<td>Wald 95% confidence limits</td>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>P-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1795</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>0.0145</td>
<td>0.1512 – 0.2079</td>
<td>154.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0304</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.0104</td>
<td>0.0101 – 0.0507</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>0.0033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.3327</td>
<td>-28.3%</td>
<td>0.0152</td>
<td>-0.3625 – -0.3030</td>
<td>479.11</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
<td>-10.7%</td>
<td>0.0238</td>
<td>-0.1596 – -0.0663</td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2462</td>
<td>-21.8%</td>
<td>0.0128</td>
<td>-0.2714 – -0.2210</td>
<td>367.67</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.1675</td>
<td>-15.4%</td>
<td>0.0535</td>
<td>-0.2724 – -0.0626</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.3152</td>
<td>-27.0%</td>
<td>0.0304</td>
<td>-0.3747 – -0.2557</td>
<td>107.79</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0971</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
<td>0.0167</td>
<td>-0.1299 – -0.0644</td>
<td>33.80</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.1522</td>
<td>-14.1%</td>
<td>0.0262</td>
<td>-0.2035 – -0.1009</td>
<td>33.84</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2391</td>
<td>-21.3%</td>
<td>0.0131</td>
<td>-0.2647 – -0.2135</td>
<td>334.67</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0733</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
<td>0.0211</td>
<td>-0.1147 – -0.0320</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.152</td>
<td>-14.1%</td>
<td>0.0104</td>
<td>-0.1724 – -0.1316</td>
<td>213.59</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.3446</td>
<td>-29.1%</td>
<td>0.0108</td>
<td>-0.3657 – -0.3235</td>
<td>1021.17</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0323</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
<td>0.0555</td>
<td>-0.1410</td>
<td>0.0764</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.3573</td>
<td>-30.0%</td>
<td>0.0100</td>
<td>-0.3769 – -0.3376</td>
<td>1271.17</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.1741</td>
<td>-16.0%</td>
<td>0.0171</td>
<td>-0.2077 – -0.1405</td>
<td>103.26</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2527</td>
<td>-22.3%</td>
<td>0.0147</td>
<td>-0.2816 – -0.2238</td>
<td>293.96</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0844</td>
<td>-8.1%</td>
<td>0.0095</td>
<td>-0.1030 – -0.0568</td>
<td>79.31</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.1343</td>
<td>-12.6%</td>
<td>0.0338</td>
<td>-0.2006 – -0.0680</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2816</td>
<td>-24.5%</td>
<td>0.0140</td>
<td>-0.3091 – -0.2542</td>
<td>405.13</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.1823</td>
<td>-16.7%</td>
<td>0.0475</td>
<td>-0.2755 – -0.0892</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.1479</td>
<td>-13.7%</td>
<td>0.0121</td>
<td>-0.1715 – -0.1243</td>
<td>150.64</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2002</td>
<td>-18.1%</td>
<td>0.0068</td>
<td>-0.2135 – -0.1868</td>
<td>860.37</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2633</td>
<td>-23.1%</td>
<td>0.0207</td>
<td>-0.3040 – -0.2227</td>
<td>161.26</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.1163</td>
<td>-11.0%</td>
<td>0.0386</td>
<td>-0.1919 – -0.0408</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2256</td>
<td>-20.2%</td>
<td>0.0105</td>
<td>-0.2460 – -0.2051</td>
<td>465.52</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.1694</td>
<td>-15.6%</td>
<td>0.0114</td>
<td>-0.1918 – -0.1470</td>
<td>219.67</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2405</td>
<td>-21.4%</td>
<td>0.0248</td>
<td>-0.2891 – -0.1918</td>
<td>93.82</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.3413</td>
<td>-28.9%</td>
<td>0.0150</td>
<td>-0.3707 – -0.3120</td>
<td>518.94</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0177</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.0608</td>
<td>-0.1369 – 0.1015</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.7712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rated driver gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0275</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
<td>0.0036</td>
<td>-0.0345 – -0.0206</td>
<td>59.90</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.1711</td>
<td>-15.7%</td>
<td>0.0164</td>
<td>-0.2033 – -0.1389</td>
<td>108.39</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rated driver marital status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1625</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>0.0038</td>
<td>0.1550 – 0.1700</td>
<td>1805.51</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1463</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>0.0158</td>
<td>0.1153 – 0.1773</td>
<td>85.57</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deductible range</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0444</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
<td>0.0296 – 0.0593</td>
<td>34.53</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101–250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2076</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>0.0050</td>
<td>0.1977 – 0.2175</td>
<td>1697.58</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2438</td>
<td>-21.6%</td>
<td>0.0047</td>
<td>-0.2530 – -0.2346</td>
<td>2700.27</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251–500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.3789</td>
<td>-31.5%</td>
<td>0.0081</td>
<td>-0.3947 – -0.3631</td>
<td>2204.67</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.3017</td>
<td>-26.0%</td>
<td>0.0069</td>
<td>-0.3151 – -0.2882</td>
<td>1931.71</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100–249</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.2415</td>
<td>-21.5%</td>
<td>0.0055</td>
<td>-0.2522 – -0.2308</td>
<td>1961.39</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250–499</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.1918</td>
<td>-17.5%</td>
<td>0.0053</td>
<td>-0.2023 – -0.1814</td>
<td>1303.22</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix: Illustrative regression results — collision claim frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Wald 95% confidence limits</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500–999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.132</td>
<td>-12.4%</td>
<td>0.0050</td>
<td>-0.1418</td>
<td>-0.1222</td>
<td>701.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0411</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
<td>0.0384</td>
<td>-0.1164</td>
<td>0.0342</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0001</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0148</td>
<td>-0.0291</td>
<td>0.0289</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0148</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.0097</td>
<td>-0.0042</td>
<td>0.0338</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0484</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
<td>0.0336</td>
<td>0.0632</td>
<td>40.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0603</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>0.0063</td>
<td>0.0479</td>
<td>0.0726</td>
<td>91.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0516</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0.0056</td>
<td>0.0406</td>
<td>0.0626</td>
<td>84.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0095</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0053</td>
<td>-0.0009</td>
<td>0.0199</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0689</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0.0059</td>
<td>0.0573</td>
<td>0.0805</td>
<td>134.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>