

Submitter: Donna Bleiler  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3917

I OPPOSE HB 3917, not the concept, but the way it is written.

"Noneconomic damages in an amount not greater than \$100,000, for any occurrence where there is no serious bodily injury or death, adjusted on an annual basis for inflation."

"Noneconomic damages" means subjective, nonmonetary losses, including but not limited to pain, mental suffering, emotional distress, humiliation, injury to reputation, inconvenience, interference with normal and usual activities apart from gainful employment, loss of consortium and loss of care, comfort, companionship and society.

Concerns that even though the funds are anticipated to come from public utilities and donors, the state is the backup guarantee. It should be structured after the Life Insurance Guarantee fund where all companies are assessed when the funds run low. Objection to auto inflation adjustments. Ultimately all funds come from ratepayers and increasing benefits translates into eventual rate increases without representation.

The covering of all "noneconomic" damages is a loser. Accept for death and disabling injury, the fund should not be used to make someone feel better about what life brings their way. Everyone has a claim for "pain, mental suffering, emotional distress, humiliation, injury to reputation, inconvenience, interference with normal and usual activities" they could make. Others should not be responsible beyond material loss., death and disability. What does any of these have to do with a wildfire disaster outside of the way they respond to a disaster?

What's the intent of Section 1 being placed into law? That belongs in a testimony argument.