



Testimony of Dennis Stefanitsis
Insurance Counsel, Uber Technologies, Inc.
in Support of HB 2286
before the
House Committee on Insurance
March 20, 2015

Good afternoon Chairman Schwab and Honorable Members of the House Committee on Insurance. My name is Dennis Stefanitsis, and I am Insurance Counsel at Uber Technologies, Inc. In addition to the testimony of my colleague William McCollum, I wish to only add a brief explanation in support of the insurance provisions of HB 2286.

A cornerstone of the Uber platform is providing a safe ride and we do so with industry leading insurance that ensures there is continuous gap free coverage from app on to app off. In fact we maintain AM Best rated "excellent" primary \$1-million commercial auto liability insurance from moment a driver accepts a request for a ride until the passenger exits the vehicle. This coverage is also more than 10 times the coverage required of a taxicab here in Topeka. This coverage is also far in excess of state automobile liability requirements of \$25,000 per person, \$50,000 per accident, and \$10,000 for property damage.

During the period of time when a driver's app is on but no ride request has been accepted, coverage is provided under the driver's own personal automobile policy and we also maintain a second policy that provides \$50,000 per person, \$100,000 for all persons and \$25,000 for property damage each accident, should the personal auto policy fail to provide coverage for any reason. Opponents of this bill will tell you that personal automobile policies do not cover this period and there is a gap, but that is clearly not the case. What most personal automobile policies do not cover is "livery", which is routinely defined as the transporting of passengers for a fee. Before a ride is accepted, however, there is no passenger, there is no fee, and therefore there is coverage. The result here is end to end coverage from app on to app off. To date in tens of millions of rides conducted over two years, there has not been one piece of litigation filed between a personal carrier and the insurer challenging coverage of Uber partner drivers. While opponents of this bill may say they fear coverage litigation clogging up the courts, those fears are unfounded and lack a basis in actual facts.

Lastly, this bill is not one sided, but respects insurer's rights to draft insurance policies how they see fit. This bill affirms the rights of insurance companies to file amendments to their policies to exclude coverage for ridesharing. As we have seen the market shape out, however, we see more companies wanting to write this type of coverage than exclude it. Moreover, the bill requires all parties to cooperate in claims investigations, yet another reason why the threat of litigation and excessive claim adjustment expenses are simply false. In sum, this bill strikes the right balance of providing insurance coverage that more than adequately protects the public, while respecting the rights of insurers who write these policies. We ask that you support this bill. Thank you.