



February 3, 2026

Via Electronic Mail (rulescoordinator@oic.wa.gov)

Office of the Insurance Commissioner, Washington State
P.O. Box 40255
Olympia, WA 98504-0255

Re: ***Rules Comment – Proposed Changes to Wash. Admin. Code 284-30-392
(Third Prepublication Draft)***

To Whom it May Concern:

CCC Intelligent Solutions, Inc. (“CCC”) respectfully submits the following comments concerning the Third Prepublication Draft changes to Wash. Admin. Code 284-30-300 through 284-30-400 relating to the claims handling minimum standards rule (the “Proposed Rule”). CCC has limited its comments to the proposed changes to Section 392(4)(d), which adds a requirement that “[w]hen the insurer uses a computerized source for determining statistically valid actual cash value...[u]pon request from the claimant, the insurer must provide supporting information to demonstrate the comparable motor vehicle’s condition.”¹

Section 392(4)(d) presents numerous concerns, including lack of clarity, an apparent focus on computerized sources for total loss valuations without justification, and its potential to increase the time and costs involved in total loss vehicle valuations.

A. Section 392(4)(d) Is Vague

Initially, CCC notes the objectives of the proposed amendments to Section 392(4)(d) lack sufficient clarity, and the specific needs they intend to address remain uncertain. In the absence of such clarification, CCC finds it challenging to suggest substantive amendments. CCC would welcome a discussion with the Department regarding its goals with respect to Section 392(4)(d).

Moreover, the language of Section 392(4)(d) itself is vague. For example, the proposed section requires an insurer relying on a computerized source to assist in determining actual cash value to “provide supporting information to demonstrate the comparable motor vehicle’s condition” upon request. It does not, however, specify what forms of “supporting information” are acceptable. Must the insurer or a third party physically inspect and document the condition of every potential comparable vehicle? Would pictures from advertisements be sufficient even if they do not document every aspect of the vehicle’s condition? Could narrative descriptions from advertisements be used as “supporting information”? The specific information necessary to meet the requirements of Section 392(4)(d) has not been clearly identified.

¹ The Proposed Rule contains other revisions about which CCC takes no position in this comment. CCC’s silence on any portion of the Proposed Rule should not be interpreted as either approval or disapproval. CCC reserves the right to comment on any portion of the Proposed Rule in the future.



Furthermore, each of these types of potential “supporting information” poses both logistical and financial challenges. CCC maintains approximately eight million unique vehicles in its databases, including about 200,000 unique vehicles within Washington State. Over twenty million unique vehicles pass through CCC’s database annually, with approximately 490,000 in Washington State alone. CCC processed approximately 120,000 valuations in Washington in 2025, which collectively included 516,000 comparable vehicles. Given these volumes, physically inspecting all comparable vehicles to assess and document their condition is functionally impossible, but the Proposed Rule could be interpreted as requiring this. And inspecting vehicles offered for sale by private owners presents additional logistical and privacy concerns. Requiring inspection of every comparable vehicle used in valuations would inevitably cause significant delays in resolving claims as well as increased expense.

Other methods for documenting vehicle condition are also insufficient. Relying on dealerships or owners for assessments of a vehicle’s condition would introduce bias and require a significant staffing and time commitment to contact each source regarding each vehicle. Online advertisements with photos are often removed after sale, making them unavailable for later review, and it is prohibitively expensive to store every advertisement with pictures over a multi-year period. Even if such storage were possible, the photos may not show every aspect of a vehicle’s condition, potentially limiting the pool of comparable vehicles available. This reduction in available data may lead to fewer comparable vehicles per file, decreasing accuracy of valuations. Currently, CCC provides on average 4.37 comparable vehicles per valuation. The change to Section 392(4)(d) would likely reduce that number significantly. The change may also result in additional requests for dealer quotes, which could increase costs and cause delays. *See* Section D.

Both the objectives and language of Section 392(4)(d) are unreasonably vague. Section 392(4)(d) fails specify what forms of “supporting information” would be acceptable and fails to articulate a clear need for the proposed changes, making it unreasonably vague. It leaves insurers and third-party valuation companies like CCC to guess at the types of information necessary, risking regulatory and legal action in the process, all while expending significant costs in attempts to comply.

B. Section 392(4)(d) Targets Computerized Sources Without Justification

Section 392(4)(d) also targets comparable vehicles used by computerized sources without a clear and specified objective. Under WAC 284-30-391(2)(b)(i) and (iii), comparable vehicles can be used to determine actual cash value without condition documentation, even if requested by the claimant. If the *exact same comparable vehicles* are utilized by computerized databases such as CCC, the database and/or the insurer must collect and document the condition of these comparable vehicles in the event a claimant requests this information. No justification has been provided for mandating documentation of the condition of a comparable vehicle when accessed via a computerized database yet not requiring the same documentation when identical vehicles are referenced through alternative methods.

It is entirely plausible that a claimant may have concerns regarding the condition of a comparable vehicle selected by an adjuster or appraiser, irrespective of whether a computerized source is employed. A human adjuster could potentially select a comparable vehicle that does not accurately reflect the condition of the loss vehicle, and the risk of a human adjuster doing so is likely greater than a computerized system like CCC’s, which incorporates multiple quality control



measures. These measures include, but are not limited to, filters to ensure completeness, verification of valid equipment, and checks for uniquely identifiable year, make, and model information, as well as key word filters that would eliminate vehicles in poor condition. Additionally, CCC's system excludes comparable vehicles that are determined to be anomalously priced, either excessively high or low.² Therefore, it is likely CCC's computerized database yields higher quality comparable vehicles than an individual adjuster or appraiser simply reviewing advertisements, yet the proposed regulation would put a greater onus on computerized databases.

In all events, requiring "supporting information" for every comparable vehicle used in valuations by a computerized database would impede the efficient operation of most computerized sources. CCC is not aware of any other state that requires such documentation, and the Department has not yet provided an explanation for the need in Washington State.

C. Section 392(4)(d) Would Increase Costs and Cause Settlement Delays

If the changes to Section 392(4)(d) were implemented as drafted, CCC anticipates that it would cause delays in settlement time as well as additional costs. Throughout the year, CCC's database contains data on nearly 500,000 distinct vehicles within Washington State alone. In order for CCC to review and retain adequate (though currently unspecified) "supporting information" for these vehicles, it would need to allocate additional personnel and expand data storage capacity. CCC estimates this would raise operational costs for CCC in excess of three million dollars, which may necessitate increased charges to insurers—costs that could ultimately be transferred to vehicle owners and claimants. This type of review would also be time-consuming and likely to delay settlement of total loss claims. Currently, CCC is able to return valuations "instantly" in Washington about 77% of the time, with the remaining valuations taking about one business day to complete. Should Section 392(4)(d) be implemented as drafted, valuations are likely to take two to three business days due to the additional research required. *See also* Section A.

Vehicle owners and claimants could experience other effects as well. For example, if a comparable vehicle lacks sufficient "supporting information," it might be removed from the

² More specifically, CCC has Field Inventory Representatives that physically inspect vehicles on more than 3,000 dealer lots across the country to ensure the vehicles used as comparables are *in at least* "Above Average" condition. If more than one component of a vehicle is not in "Above Average" condition, CCC excludes the vehicle from its database. Similarly, CCC excludes listings from entire dealerships that are not reputable or that routinely sell vehicles in less than "Above Average" condition. CCC also uses publications and data feeds only from industry-leading, reputable sources (*e.g.*, Cars.com, autotrader.com, TrueCar) and applies search term and quality filters to these data feeds to automatically exclude from the comparable vehicle database dealer-listed vehicles that are not in "Above Average" condition, or do not meet other quality criteria. On top of these quality checks on the front end of what comes into the comparable vehicle database, CCC employs further checks on the back end during each valuation to ensure that any comparable vehicle selected does not fall too far outside the statistical mode for the price of a dealer-listed vehicle of the same make/model/type as the loss vehicle at that time in the local market area. This check further ensures that CCC excludes any dealer-listed comparable vehicle priced to reflect a condition other than "Above Average."



database. This would reduce the number of vehicles available for comparison, possibly decreasing the accuracy of valuations and leading to increased dependence on dealer quotations, which typically take longer to acquire, if they can be acquired at all. *See also* Section D. Valuation cycle times are likely to increase, resulting in delayed relief for vehicle owners and claimants, as well as higher storage and rental costs. All of this would place a strain on resources, extend claims processing times, and increase costs.

D. The Proposed Rule Does Not Provide Sufficient Alternatives to a Computerized Database

In the event that computerized sources are unable to meet the requirements of Section 392(4)(d), the Proposed Rule does not offer viable alternatives for determining actual cash value of a loss vehicle. WAC 284-30-391(2)(b)(i) and (iii) permit using comparable vehicles to determine actual cash value, but without a computerized database, adjusters and appraisers must find these comparables manually, which slows total loss claim resolution. WAC 284-30-391(2)(b)(ii) allows for the use of dealer quotes, but many dealers in Washington do not wish to field frequent phone calls asking for quotes, as there is little upside to the dealer in becoming involved in disputes between insurance companies and claimants.³ Therefore, many dealers simply decline to provide quotes. Moreover, substantial dependence on dealer quotations would *considerably* slow the claims resolution process. CCC typically makes between 6 and 18 calls to dealers to obtain a single quote. If even half of CCC’s monthly volume required dealer quotes, the company would need to make *over 100,000 phone calls per month* to secure the two quotes necessary for each file. This process would also lead to a substantial increase in the costs associated with obtaining such quotations for both insurers and claimants.

As CCC understands the Proposed Rule, these options (finding comparables manually or using dealer quotes) are the only two alternatives to a computerized database. The Proposed Rule does not allow, for example, the use of a nationally or regionally recognized guidebook, a common alternative in many states. But without access to a computerized database, the two alternatives in the Proposed Rule are inadequate for large-scale claims handling. If the Department enacts the proposed changes to Section 392(4)(d), CCC encourages the Department to explore additional options, like guidebooks, for vehicle valuation.

As noted above, however, CCC finds the Department’s objectives for the proposed amendments to Section 392(4)(d) unclear. Without this clarity, CCC is unable to offer well-informed alternatives that might promote greater sustainability for insurers and organizations such as CCC while still supporting the Department’s intended outcomes. By way of example, if the Department has proposed the changes to Section 392(4)(d) because it has concerns about computerized systems adjustments to comparable vehicles relating to condition, there are likely other ways for computerized systems to address those concerns. CCC would be happy to discuss other options with the Department.



³ CCC is aware of dealership personnel who have been verbally harassed and physically threatened over quotes they have provided for total loss valuations.



For at least the reasons discussed herein, CCC urges the proposed changes to Section 392(4)(d) be stricken and not adopted. Alternatively, CCC recommends that the Department initiate more comprehensive discussions with computerized valuation firms such as CCC. This would enable these companies to gain a clearer understanding of the Department's rationale for the proposed modifications and position them to offer constructive support in pursuing alternative approaches to achieve those objectives.

CCC appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Proposed Rule and looks forward to continued discussion regarding this matter. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like any additional information or to discuss anything further.

Sincerely,

/s/Kathleen P. Lally

Associate General Counsel