TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY
Institute for a Disaster Resilient Texas

Executive Summary

RESILIENT ROOF AND HOME MITIGATION GRANT PROGRAMS

Prepared for
Texas Department of Insurance
Contract Number: M2603558
September 30, 2026

Contact: Meri Davlasheridze, PhD; email: davlashm@tamu.edu

Executive Summary

Texas A&M University at Galveston (TAMUG) was contracted by the Texas Department of Insurance to conduct an analysis and review of states' incentive programs related to construction of homes and roofs to more resilient standards. The study was conducted in accordance with Texas Insurance Code Section 2210.015. The study reviewed state residential resilience and roof mitigation programs across Alabama (AL), Florida (FL), Louisiana (LA), Mississippi (MS), North Carolina (NC), Oklahoma (OK), and South Carolina (SC), covering program design, funding mechanisms, homeowner participation, insurer incentives, and adoption of the IBHS FORTIFIED standard.[1] The review also examined available information on homeowner participation, insurance market impacts, and implementation practices to identify lessons that may inform future residential mitigation initiatives in Texas.

Program Design: AL, LA, MS, NC, and OK have developed programs that primarily support upgrades to the FORTIFIED Roof standard, using this designation as the principal benchmark for residential resilience. SC similarly supports FORTIFIED Roof retrofits through its Resilient Mitigation Award program while also funding other qualified mitigation measures. In contrast, Florida's My Safe Florida Home program funds a broader range of wind-mitigation improvements, including opening protection, roof-to-wall connections, roof deck attachment improvements, and secondary water resistance measures, without directly requiring FORTIFIED certification. Despite differences in administration and eligibility requirements, roof-focused mitigation remains the dominant strategy across nearly all reviewed programs.

Program Funding: Although states have adopted different administrative structures, most programs have converged around similar financial assistance levels, typically providing grants of up to $10,000 per home. Funding mechanisms, however, differ across states. FL relies heavily on legislative appropriations, NC funds programs through residual market insurance mechanisms, SC combines appropriations with insurance-related revenues, and LA has expanded funding through a combination of legislative appropriations, insurance-related revenues, and Louisiana Citizens Property Insurance Corporation, the state's insurer of last resort for property owners unable to obtain coverage in the private market. In contrast, AL, MS, and OK have established funding structures tied to insurance-sector revenues. AL's Strengthen Alabama Homes program is supported through statutorily authorized transfers from the Alabama Insurance Department Fund[2]. MS established a dedicated funding stream through insurance agent licensing fees that are deposited into the Strengthen Mississippi Homes Fund, while OK created a dedicated revolving fund that may receive program revenues, grants, and authorized transfers from the State Insurance Commissioner Revolving Fund. These approaches reduce reliance on recurring legislative appropriations, although funding levels remain dependent on available revenues, transfers, grants,

[1] IBHS FORTIFIED is reroofing standard developed by the Insurance Institute for Business & Home Safety (IBHS) to improve a structure's resistance to severe weather hazards such as hurricanes, high winds, hail, and tornadoes. FORTIFIED certification requires specific resilience measures and independent third-party verification that construction standards have been met

[2] The Insurance Department Fund is a state fund administered by the Alabama Department of Insurance that receives insurance-related fees, licensing fees, assessments, and other regulatory revenues collected from insurers and insurance professionals.

or other authorized funding sources. However, the Mississippi and Oklahoma programs are relatively new and remain in the early stages of implementation, whereas Alabama's program has operated since 2016 and has supported more than 10,000 grants and over $100 million in mitigation investments, and facilitated the largest concentration of FORTIFIED homes among the states reviewed.

Homeowner Participation and Demand: Consumer participation data indicate strong homeowner interest in mitigation assistance. Several states report demand that exceeds available funding. AL documented thousands of applicants awaiting funding during multiple years, while FL accumulated substantial application backlogs despite receiving hundreds of millions of dollars in appropriations. Available evidence suggests that these backlogs were driven primarily by homeowner demand exceeding available grant funding, as demonstrated by multiple legislative appropriations specifically intended to fund previously approved or pending grant applications. LA implemented a lottery-based grant allocation process because demand exceeded available funding, and recent program expansions continue to attract strong homeowner interest. NC's programs processed nearly 15,000 applications and awarded more than $93 million in grants, demonstrating sustained participation over multiple years. South Carolina's program has awarded approximately 8,665 grants and more than $43 million in assistance since its inception, reflecting long-term homeowner participation in the program over nearly two decades. Even recently established programs in MS and OK experienced significant initial demand despite funding interruptions and phased implementation. These patterns suggest that financial barriers are an important constraint for many homeowners seeking to undertake mitigation improvements and that grant assistance can expand participation in resilience programs. At the same time, substantial mitigation activity outside grant programs also indicates that homeowner adoption is influenced by a broader set of economic, insurance, and risk-reduction considerations.

Insurer Participation and Incentives: Most states complement mitigation grants with insurance incentives designed to recognize reduced risk. AL, FL, LA, NC, and SC require insurers to recognize qualifying mitigation measures through premium credits, discounts, or actuarially supported rate differentials, while MS and OK report broad participation through voluntary premium discount programs. Several states have also implemented or encouraged FORTIFIED-related endorsements, although availability varies across insurers and markets. Reported premium reductions range from modest savings to more than 50% of applicable wind premiums in some cases. In addition to premium reductions, some evidence suggests that FORTIFIED homes may receive more favorable underwriting consideration, particularly in AL and LA. However, data on endorsements, deductible reductions, and underwriting practices remain limited.

IBHS FORTIFIED Adoption Patterns: IBHS certification data reveal substantial variation in adoption across states. AL leads all reviewed states with more than 76,000 FORTIFIED certifications through September 2026, followed by NC with more than 28,000 certifications and LA with nearly 15,700 certifications. In most states, certifications are concentrated at the Roof level and associated with the Hurricane designation.[3] AL and FL differ somewhat from this pattern because Gold certifications

[3] IBHS FORTIFIED™ designations include Roof, Silver, and Gold levels that represent increasing levels of mitigation protection. Hazard-specific designations, such as Hurricane and High Wind, indicate that mitigation measures are designed to address regionally relevant wind hazards.

represent a relatively larger share of their overall certification portfolios. In Oklahoma adoption is driven almost entirely by High Wind certifications, reflecting exposure to tornadoes, hail, and severe convective storms. Across all states reviewed, the certification data suggest that roof-level mitigation remains the most common and scalable pathway for residential resilience improvements.

Remaining Information Gaps: While most states report basic information such as grants awarded, expenditures, and cumulative mitigation accomplishments, more detailed information on applicants, mitigation levels, insurer-specific incentives, endorsement uptake, underwriting practices, and movements from residual insurance markets to the voluntary market is often unavailable or inconsistently reported. AL and NC provide some of the most comprehensive participation datasets, whereas information remains more limited in SC and, for several key metrics, LA.

IBHS projects in Texas: Through September 2026, Texas recorded 405 FORTIFIED certifications, including both Hurricane and High Wind designations, with participation increasing in recent years. While these numbers remain modest relative to Texas's housing stock at risk, they provide evidence of homeowner interest in resilient roofing even without dedicated public incentives. The presence of both Hurricane and High Wind certifications reflects Texas's diverse hazard profile and demonstrates interest in mitigating a range of wind-related risks.

Executive Summary Table of Residential Mitigation Programs[1]

State	Inception Year	First Year Grants Awarded	Primary Mitigation Focus[2]	Primary Funding Source	Maximum Grant ($)[3]	Homeowner Contribution	Number of Grants Awarded	Amount of Grants Awarded	Premium Reduction/ Incentive[4]	FORTIFIED Upgrade Coverage?[5]	Total IBHS FORTIFIED Certification[6]
AL	2011	2013 (initial); 2016 (regular recurring grant awards began)	FORTIFIED Roof	Insurance-related fees and Insurance Department Fund[5]	10,000	Homeowner pays excess costs	10,437	$103.1M	20%-55%	Yes, must offer option to cover extra cost to upgrade to FORTIFIED	76,749
FL	2006 (2022-reintroduced)	2007	Broader range of wind mitigation options	Legislative appropriations	10,000	State pays $2 for every $1 homeowner contributes; low-income grants may waive match	~40,000	$216.8M obligated ($35.8M disbursed)	Varies by mitigation feature	No	916
LA	2022	2023	FORTIFIED Roof	Legislative appropriations and insurance-related revenues	10,000	Homeowner pays excess costs.	5,399	Not reported	16%-49%	Yes	15,700
MS	2024 (2026-reestablished)	2026 (limited coastal rollout)	FORTIFIED Roof	Insurance-related fees and legislative appropriations	10,000	Homeowner pays excess costs	28	$0.3M	5%-55%	Yes, must offer option to cover extra cost to upgrade to FORTIFIED	3,136
NC	2019 (SYR); 2022 (SYCR); 2026 (SRG)[7]	2019 (SYR); 2022 (SYCR); 2026 (SRG)	FORTIFIED Roof	Residual market mechanisms	6,000-10,000	Homeowner pays excess costs	13,688	$93.6M	7%	No statewide requirement; available through NCIUA	28,052
OK	2024	2025 (pilot); 2026 (statewide program launched)	FORTIFIED Roof	Revolving fund and state funding transfers	10,000	Homeowner pays excess costs	434	$4.25M	3%-42%	No	700
SC	2007	2007	Broader range of wind mitigation options	Insurance-related revenues and appropriations	3,000-7,500	Matching and non-matching awards based on income and grant category	8,665	~$43M	12%-20%	No	977

[1] Except for North Carolina, programs are administered by state insurance departments. North Carolina's programs are administered by the North Carolina Insurance Underwriting Association (NCIUA) and the North Carolina Joint Underwriting Association (NCJUA/FAIR Plan).

[2] Florida's program supports a broader range of wind-mitigation improvements, including roof-to-wall connections, roof-deck attachment, secondary water resistance, and opening protection, and does not require IBHS FORTIFIED certification. North Carolina's programs primarily serve NCIUA and NCJUA policyholders. South Carolina Safe Home funds a range of wind-mitigation upgrades, including FORTIFIED Roof retrofits, opening protection, and structural strengthening improvements; participation is not limited to projects achieving an IBHS FORTIFIED designation.

[3] Maximum grant amounts reflect program caps. Homeowners generally pay project costs exceeding the grant award unless otherwise specified.

[4] The rate reductions typically applies to the wind, wind/hail, or hurricane portion of the insurance premium and are not directly comparable across states because of differences in insurers, rating plans, coverage, mitigation features, certification levels, and location. Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi require premium discounts for homes with IBHS FORTIFIED certification, while North Carolina requires mitigation credits that include specific credits for FORTIFIED Roof, Silver, and Gold designations. Florida and South Carolina require premium credits for qualifying wind-mitigation features but do not require FORTIFIED certification. Oklahoma does not require discounts, although insurers may voluntarily offer them for FORTIFIED-certified homes.

[5] This column summarizes whether state law mandates insurers to offer a FORTIFIED Endorsement as an optional homeowners insurance policy add-on that helps pay the extra costs to upgrade the roof to IBHS standards after a covered storm or wind loss. Requirements and availability vary across states and insurers.

[6] IBHS FORTIFIED certification totals are cumulative through September 2026 and include certifications obtained both through and outside state mitigation grant programs.

[7] North Carolina operates three programs: (1) Strengthen Your Roof program (SYR), (2) Strengthen Your Coastal Roof program (SYCR), (3) Stronger Roof Grant program (SRG).