



CONTRACTORS STATE LICENSE BOARD

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Joint Board Meeting Minutes – September 5, 2025

A. Call to Order, Roll Call, Establishment of Quorum, and Chair's Introduction

Board Chair Miguel Galarza called the meeting of the Contractors State License Board (CSLB) to order on September 5, 2025, at 8:30 a.m. at the John C. Hall Hearing Room, 9821 Business Park Drive, Sacramento, CA 95827.

Nevada State Contractors Board Chair Kent Lay led the Pledge of Allegiance, and a quorum was established.

Board Members Present

Miguel Galarza, Chair
Alan Guy, Vice Chair
Joël Barton
Rodney Cobos
Amanda Gallo
Jacob Lopez
Diana Love
Michael Mark
Henry Nutt III
Josef Preciado
Thomas Ruiz
Mary Teichert

James Ruane and Steve Panelli had approved absences.

CSLB Staff Present

David Fogt, Registrar
Estelle Champlain, Chief Deputy Registrar
Rebecca May, Chief of Legislation
Steve Grove, Chief of Enforcement
Carol Gagnon, Chief of Licensing
Katherine White, Chief of Public Affairs
David Gower, Public Affairs Supervisor
Michael Jamnetski, Special Projects Manager
Amy Lawrence, Television Specialist
Natalie Watmore, Information Officer
Robin Williams, Executive Analyst

DCA Staff Present

John Kinn, DCA Legal Counsel

**B. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda and Future Agenda Item Requests**Board Member Comment

There was no comment.

Public Comment

There was no comment.

C. Presentation by Tom Roadcamp, Civil Engineer, Brightline West, Regarding High-Speed Passenger Rail Project Update

CSLB Chair Galarza asked NSCB Chair, Kent Lay, to start the presentation for agenda item C.

Chair Lay introduced the first agenda item, an update on the high-speed passenger rail project, presented by Tom Roadcamp, a civil engineer with Brightline West. Roadcamp brings experience from the Florida line expansion and various safety projects. Chair Lay welcomed him and invited him to begin his presentation.

Roadcamp said Brightline West is a new high-speed rail project connecting Southern California to Las Vegas, following the company's higher-speed rail line operating between Miami and Orlando. The 220-mile corridor will run from Las Vegas to Rancho Cucamonga, California, using fully electric trains with zero emissions and no at-grade crossings. Trains will operate at speeds up to 186 mph, completing the trip in about two hours, with hourly departures in each direction and an expected annual ridership of 8.6 million passengers.

Roadcamp said the project originated with Desert Express, which completed the first environmental studies in 2011. Brightline took over in 2018, optimized the design, cost, and schedule, and in 2023 the project secured a federal-state partnership grant with the Nevada Department of Transportation. Groundbreaking occurred in 2024, and construction is now underway. The work is divided into packages, including civil construction for guideways, structures, and drainage; track and systems installation; and vertical construction for stations and maintenance facilities.

Roadcamp explained that most of the line will be a single track with passing sections strategically placed to maintain hourly service. Stations will include a Las Vegas hub near Interstate 15 and Las Vegas Boulevard, a full-service Victor Valley station, a commuter-focused Hesperia station, and a major Southern California terminal at Rancho Cucamonga, which will connect directly to Metrolink and offer large parking facilities.

Roadcamp stated that Siemens Mobility is supplying 10 trainsets, each with seven cars and seating for about 430 passengers, with the ability to double capacity during peak demand. A dedicated maintenance facility in Sloan, Nevada, will handle inspections,



servicing, and heavy maintenance. Roadcamp finished by thanking the NSCB for allowing the opportunity to provide an update on the project.

Board Member Comment

Chair Lay asked whether Brightline West is on track to meet its target completion date of 2028 and when visible construction activity along Interstate 15 will begin.

Roadcamp explained that some early work is already underway, including geotechnical boring along the alignment to complete design elements, initial construction at the Las Vegas station site, and preliminary utility work near Sloan Road along Interstate 15 in Nevada.

Public Comment

There was no comment.

D. Joint Discussion with Nevada State Contractors Board (NSCB)

Chair Galarza began a joint discussion with NSCB, introducing its Executive Officer David Behar and CSLB's Registrar David Fogt to lead the conversation.

1. Discussion Regarding CSLB and NSCB Operational and Structural Comparison

Registrar Fogt provided updates on four items. First, California's contractor license population increased only 1 percent since June 2024, adding about 624 licenses, but the fund balance remains strong with over a six-month reserve of about \$50 million. Second, the state expanded reciprocity agreements, previously with Arizona, Nevada, and Louisiana, to now include North Carolina. Reciprocity allows waiving trade exams for certain classifications, though applicants must still pass the law and business exam. Third, licensing data showed around 100 out-of-state contractors sought California licenses through reciprocity in the past year, while about 2,000 California licensees pursued licenses in other states, mainly to expand business rather than relocate. Finally, the Board recently approved trade exam waivers for out-of-state licensees who have held licenses in good standing for at least five years and passed the NASCLA commercial builders' exam, which closely aligns with California's general building exam. Additionally, California can waive the trade exam for the B-2 Residential Remodeling license when applicants hold equivalent licenses in other states.

Chief of Licensing, Carol Gagnon, expressed interest in expanding reciprocity agreements with more states, noting that contractors can already work in many places, even internationally, and that creating additional opportunities would benefit licensees.

Registrar Fogt provided several California updates. First, the minor work exemption was increased from \$500 to \$1,000, but with restrictions including no permits can be required and no workers may be hired — to prevent unsafe unlicensed work and issues with workers' compensation. Second, on restitution, CSLB's enforcement program



recovered nearly \$35.3 million for consumers in the last fiscal year, including over \$27.8 million through settlements and \$7.4 million from assisting with civil judgment collections. Third, on complaints, unlicensed contractor complaints dropped to 19 percent of total cases (historically 20–25 percent), and solar complaints also declined, from about 220 per month to 180. However, accessory dwelling unit (ADU) complaints are rising sharply. In the past 18 months, five contractors alone generated 462 complaints, with one high-profile company leaving more than 260 consumers with unfinished ADUs despite receiving substantial payments.

Executive Officer Behar gave an update on Nevada’s licensing and enforcement activities. Nevada added nearly 660 new licenses last year, bringing the total to about 19,000, and introduced three new license types, including a restricted license, expected to attract more applicants. Licensing fees remain \$300, or \$600 for expedited processing, and Nevada continues to offer a handyman license for jobs under \$1,000 that do not involve life-safety trades. Nevada has reciprocity agreements with 12 states, including California, and works closely with other boards to protect consumers while allowing cross-border business opportunities. Solar remains a top source of complaints, prompting Nevada to establish a solar investigation unit and adopt a watch list, similar to California’s, which has helped reduce complaints.

Executive Officer Behar said the state’s residential recovery fund provides up to \$40,000 for homeowners harmed by licensed contractors and has been awarded about \$17 million since inception. Nevada has also implemented a language access plan, securing \$300,000 in grants to provide multilingual kiosks in Board offices and improve online communication for consumers and contractors. The Board updated its website and IT systems to modernize services. Finally, the Commission on Construction Education funds workforce development through grants, repurposing fine money back into the community.

Board Member Comment

Board Member Mary Teichert praised Nevada for having more reciprocity agreements than California and highlighted the benefits such agreements provide contractors while still protecting consumers. She then asked whether Nevada has seen any differences in complaint outcomes between contractors with reciprocal licenses and those with standard state-issued licenses.

Executive Officer Behar responded that Nevada has not seen problems with contractors coming in through reciprocity agreements. He noted a recent bill on rural housing that raised concerns about out-of-state contractors but explained that Nevada’s approach is to keep opportunities open while maintaining a balanced focus on protecting in-state license holders and consumers.

Member Teichert suggested it would be useful for California to track data on reciprocal license holders and their outcomes.



Registrar Fogt said contractors who obtained licenses through reciprocity exam waivers receive significantly fewer consumer complaints compared to the general licensed population.

Special Projects Manager Michael Jamnetski agreed that it was negligible.

Member Teichert encouraged pursuing more reciprocity agreements with other states, saying it benefits contractors by reducing redundant exams while showing no negative impact on consumer protection.

Board Member Cobos asked whether the list of states with reciprocal agreements, including the newest ones, is available on CSLB's website.

Registrar Fogt confirmed the reciprocity information is on the website and asked Chief Gagnon to explain which information is posted there and how people can request reciprocity, saying the process is designed to be simple and straightforward.

Chief Gagnon explained that while North Carolina is still being added, the CSLB website already has a dedicated reciprocity section outlining requirements by state, including for those who passed the NASCLA B exam. She said the site is clear but also encouraged applicants to email CSLB's licensing division for guidance if they need help determining which forms to complete.

Chair Galarza said he has personally gone through more than ten reciprocity agreements with different states, finding Nevada one of the easiest. He suggested assigning reciprocity as an agenda item for the Licensing Committee.

Chair Galarza also brought up Nevada's mention of a recovery fund and proposed discussing California's recovery fund as a future agenda topic.

Registrar Fogt explained that California previously had a solar recovery fund funded by a general appropriation. The Board has considered creating a broader recovery fund but has not pursued that due to concerns that good contractors would have to cover damages caused by bad actors. He noted that with the solar fund, some contractors who took large sums avoided prosecution because homeowner losses were resolved through the fund. Registrar Fogt said that if a recovery fund is revisited, it should include a mechanism for replenishment and likely be assigned to the Legislative Committee to evaluate, including gathering input from Nevada about their fee structure.

Executive Officer Behar explained that license renewals are conducted annually and cost between \$80 and \$400, depending on the license's monetary limit.

Chair Galarza asked about the balance of the recovery fund.

Registrar Fogt clarified that California's solar recovery fund was a one-time \$5 million appropriation, which has been fully expended, including staff costs. The fund no longer



exists, and any exploration of a new recovery fund would likely need to go through the Legislative Committee and involve stakeholder discussions.

Chair Galarza agreed to add that as a future agenda item.

Registrar Fogt asked if any board members could provide an update on workforce development programs in California, noting that many trades already have such initiatives.

Board Member Henry Nutt III asked for clarification on what specific aspect of workforce development the discussion should focus on.

Registrar Fogt highlighted outreach and apprenticeship programs that support individuals in pursuing construction careers and asked what efforts the trades are making to encourage people to enter the industry.

Member Nutt III explained that labor unions like Local 104 are increasing outreach to schools, introducing students to construction careers earlier than high school. He stressed the importance of reshaping perceptions so construction is seen as a respected, viable career, not a backup option. He said parents also need education to encourage this path. Partnerships with community colleges and training programs are helping, but outreach still lags behind. He said the effort is moving in the right direction, and CSLB can play a role in raising awareness and connecting people to opportunities in the trades.

Board Member Michael Mark said, in addition to local outreach, there are national programs like the MC3 (Multi-Craft Core Curriculum) and apprenticeship readiness programs that prepare individuals for careers in the trades. These programs help people gain the journey-level experience required for licensure and allow them to explore different trades such as ironwork, electrical, plumbing, and sheet metal before choosing a path. Many licensed business owners started through these apprenticeship programs, which are available across California, in every county, and even in Nevada. Member Mark emphasized the importance of these programs in providing career pathways and encouraged people to explore them through the national building trades website.

Member Teichert shared two initiatives she is working on. First, a partnership with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and the Northern California Construction Training Center to create smoother transitions for formerly incarcerated individuals into the construction workforce. She emphasized construction as a strong second-chance career, noting programs like Ventura's firefighter training center that drastically reduced recidivism rates. Second, she highlighted efforts by the Department of Industrial Relations to support women in construction, including an advisory committee and grants to remove barriers such as childcare.

Board Member Jacob Lopez, with the carpenters union, described four major recruitment efforts. First was "Combine Day," modeled after the NFL combine, where



candidates showcase basic skills for contractors, who can hire them on the spot. Second was “Career Connections,” a high school program in LAUSD that provides curriculum and instructors, culminating in an open house to connect graduates with jobs. Third was the Carson recruiting program, focused on underserved communities and second-chance opportunities for formerly incarcerated individuals. Lastly, the union runs a Cal Poly internship program to train project managers and estimators, bridging communication between office staff and field workers. These initiatives aim to expand recruitment, support workforce development, and ensure contractor success.

Chair Galarza discussed San Francisco’s City Build program, established over 15 years ago with support from the governor and the building trades, which set a 30 percent local hire goal to ensure community members benefited from construction jobs. The program included agreements with unions and pathways for both field and office roles (e.g., estimators, accountants, administrators). He noted the success of project labor agreements (PLAs) and emphasized that workforce development, apprenticeship programs, and community-based hiring are essential to lift all communities during California’s economic growth.

Member Nutt also cited partnerships with groups like Southwest Center, People Working Together, Cypress Mandela, and Rising Sun that provide robust training tied to contractors, stressing that contractor engagement turns classroom training into real careers.

Member Teichert said hiring formerly incarcerated individuals has been effective, but said federal restrictions often block them from working on certain projects (like schools or airports), despite being allowed on highways and other jobs. She said opportunity, not training programs, is the real barrier, contractor partnerships are key to providing that opportunity.

Chair Lay thanked participants for the discussion.

Public Comment

There was no comment.

E. Discussion Regarding Surety Bonds

NSCB Chair, Lay, introduced Item E: Surety Bonds and welcomed Joe Hernandez, a former Board member and subject matter expert from Branch Hernandez Consulting. Hernandez’s firm specializes in commercial insurance, employee benefits, and risk management for governmental, educational, and corporate clients, and has received recognition as Diversity Vendor of the Year by the American Gaming Association and MGM Grand International.



1. Nevada Subject Matter Expert

Hernandez thanked both the Nevada and California Contractors Boards and introduced the topic of surety bonds. He explained that surety bonds function like a money-back guarantee, ensuring contractors complete work as agreed. He gave a brief history, noting bonds date back thousands of years. Hernandez outlined various types of bonds: contract bonds (performance, payment, submission, license bonds), offsite improvement bonds (for street/sidewalk work around projects), and miscellaneous bonds (environmental, decommissioning, financial guarantees, transportation). He compared surety bonds vs. insurance: surety bonds involve three parties (surety, principal, obligee) and require the contractor (principal) to reimburse the surety if claims are paid. Insurance involves two parties (insurer and policyholder), with the insurer covering specified losses. He stressed the importance of evaluating a bond provider's financial strength, credit rating, and reputation. Premiums depend on the contractor's credit, financial stability, and risk. Finally, Hernandez emphasized that bonds are usually continuous (cannot be canceled) and only end once obligations are fulfilled.

Board Member Comment

There was no comment.

Public Comment

There was no comment.

2. California Subject Matter Expert

CSLB Chair Galarza, speaking as a contractor, acknowledged being familiar with surety bond requirements and the process of becoming bondable. He introduced Manager Jamnetski, who provided further details based on staff research and bond requirements.

Manager Jamnetski discussed the Board's oversight of five types of bonds and explained the context for their requirements. A legislative bond study prompted raising the standard contractor license bond from \$15,000 to \$25,000, effective January 1, 2023, to better protect consumers. The five bonds include the license bond (\$25,000 required for all contractors), the qualifier bond (\$25,000 for non-owner qualifiers), the Limited Liability Company (LLC) worker bond (\$100,000 for LLC licensees to ensure payment of wages and benefits), the disciplinary bond (\$25,000 – \$400,000 for reinstatement after discipline, depending on circumstances), and the blanket performance and payment bond (optional, \$1 million – \$10 million for large home improvement companies, covering all contracts and allowing exceptions to down payment rules). He emphasized that CSLB bonds focus on consumer protection and contractor compliance with licensing law, while typical contract performance bonds are tied to individual projects and payments.

Registrar Fogt stated that a California bill aimed at clarifying that accessory dwelling units (ADUs) on residential properties falls under home improvement regulations was intended to limit payment restrictions. The bill faced opposition and became a two-year



bill. He said obtaining a payment and performance bond for an ADU would cost roughly 2 percent of the contract price and asked whether Nevada residential contractors commonly use such bonds. Registrar Fogt said that while bonding is standard in public works in California, the question was whether project-specific bonding, beyond the general license bond, is also common for residential construction in Nevada.

Board Member Comment

Hernandez explained that bonding requirements varied depending on the project. For large-scale construction projects, such as casinos or stadiums, payment and performance bonds, bid bonds, and completion bonds are often required by the general contractor or project owner. An alternative option is a subcontractor default insurance policy, which general contractors can purchase to protect against subcontractor failures. This ensures subcontractors are financially stable and that projects can be completed even if issues arise. Ultimately, the type of bond or coverage depends on project size and specific requirements, and contractors must be financially prepared to meet those obligations when bidding.

Chair Lay, a home builder, said residential construction generally does not require payment or performance bonds. The only bonds typically posted are those required by cities or counties for offsite construction work, such as infrastructure, to ensure completion. He said these requirements are consistently set by municipalities, with limits determined based on the specific project. Subcontractors in residential construction are usually not required to provide such bonds.

CSLB Vice Chair Guy asked for clarification on how license bonds work in Nevada compared to California. He said in California there is only one set bond amount of \$25,000 and wanted to know if Nevada's system differs by having varying bond thresholds based on project size or contractor type, and how those requirements are structured.

License Administrator Susan Broili Kamesch explained that in Nevada, surety bonds are tied to the contractor's licensed monetary limit. For example, if a contractor applies for a \$10,000 limit, the bond would be around \$2,000, but bonds can go as high as \$50,000 under standard financial responsibility reviews. Additionally, the Board has the discretion to require higher bond amounts if deemed necessary.

Vice Chair Guy said that in Nevada the standard maximum bond amount is \$50,000 for large license types, unless the Board decides to require a higher amount.

License Administrator Broili Kamesch agreed with Member Guy's comment.

Chair Galarza suggested that California might consider adjusting its bonding requirements to provide greater industry protection.

Public Comment

There was no comment.



Member Mary Teichert left the meeting at 9:30 a.m.

F. Discussion Regarding Legislation and Classification Changes to Removing Barriers to Licensure

NSCB Chair Lay began discussion on agenda item F on legislation and classification changes related to licensing barriers. He introduced Board Member Boyd Martin to lead the discussion on Nevada's new B-7 license classification and the recently added restricted license opportunity.

1. Presentation Regarding NSCB B-7 Restricted License

Member Martin explained the background and development of Nevada's new B-7 license classification and restricted license opportunity. Inspired by California's B-2 license, Nevada created the B-7 license to provide an entry point into the industry, but initial participation was low. In response, Senate Bill 130 was introduced to expand opportunities by creating a restricted category under the B-7 license. This allows contractors to perform small residential projects up to \$7,000, a significant increase from the previous \$1,000 handyman limit. Applicants are not required to take a trade exam but must have two years of experience, complete a business class, and post a \$2,000 bond. The new license gives homeowners access to the state's residential recovery fund, while providing a path for licensees to advance to the full B-7 license after gaining more experience. The program aims to address the shortage of licensed contractors for small residential remodels, improve consumer protection, and reduce unlicensed work. The Board is also working to make testing available in Spanish and hopes to implement the program earlier than the legislative deadline.

Board Member Comment

Chair Galarza praised Nevada's efforts and asked whether workers are required to hold the new restricted license, and if exemptions apply, meaning whether every worker on a job must have that license.

Member Martin explained that in Nevada, holders of the restricted B-7 license must meet the same insurance requirements as any other license. Sole proprietors are not required to carry workers' compensation, but if they have employees, they must provide it.

Chair Galarza said California has a strong interest in monitoring Nevada's new restricted B-7 license to see whether it leads to violations or misuse. He emphasized wanting to understand if it truly serves as a stepping-stone license and how Nevada's higher exemption amount impacts consumer protection, since California remains cautious about expanding exemptions.

Member Martin expressed optimism that Nevada's new restricted B-7 license will protect the public while creating a legal pathway for more individuals to become fully licensed contractors.



Public Comment

There was no public comment.

2. Presentation Regarding CSLB B-2 Residential Remodeling License and Minor Work Exemption Increase

Chair Galarza transitioned the discussion to the Handypersons Advisory Committee, noting that Board Members Diana Love and Joël Barton would be giving a joint presentation.

Member Love reviewed the development and purpose of California's B-2 Residential Remodeling license, created after the Camp Fire to fill a market gap for contractors with multi-trade experience who did not qualify for a general license and to aid in wildfire recovery. The license applies to contracts requiring three or more trades on wood-frame residential structures, though it excludes behind-the-wall mechanical, electrical, and plumbing work. Unlike Nevada's B-7 license, California's B-2 still requires four years of experience plus passing law and trade exams.

Member Love also discussed CSLB's consideration of a provisional license tied to the minor work exemption, though concerns about consumer protection and the underground economy prevented adoption. She said CSLB staff will monitor Nevada's B-7 license and report back in 2026. Member Love highlighted California's increase in the minor work exemption from \$500 to \$1,000, aimed at expanding lawful work opportunities and encouraging pathways to licensure. Member Love emphasized efforts to bridge entry barriers for smaller trade workers and reported that 1,280 B-2 licenses had been issued. She closed by encouraging promotion of the B-2 license and invited fellow Member Barton to add comments.

Member Barton expressed support for the B-2 residential remodeling license as a way to reduce barriers to licensure for individuals performing multiple minor trades in residential construction but lacking the structural or specialized background needed for a general or specialty license. He emphasized the importance of creating pathways for B-2 license holders to eventually qualify for a general contractor license when they gain sufficient experience. Member Barton also supported allowing unlicensed individuals working lawfully under the \$1,000 exemption to apply for a B-2 license once they have four years of qualifying experience. He concluded by noting that Member Martin has obtained the B-2 classification and invited him to comment.

Board Member Comment

Member Martin said they had already addressed the B-7 license in their earlier comments and did not have any additional comments unless there was a misunderstanding of the question.



Member Barton said while increasing the minor work exemption can be beneficial, it is crucial to ensure that work performed within that threshold maintains safety standards and that any employees involved are properly covered by workers' compensation insurance.

Member Love asked whether the four years of industry or high school training could potentially count toward qualification for the B-2 license, either currently or in the future.

Member Lopez said the training mentioned would likely not qualify toward meeting the B-2 license requirements.

Chair Galarza said JATC training counts as college credits, but those credits do not apply toward the B-2 license requirements.

Member Mark said four years of verified hands-on trade experience is required for the B-2 license, and applicants must provide proof of that experience when applying.

Member Love acknowledged the clarification and that the explanation was helpful.

Public Comment

There was no comment.

G. Discussion Regarding NSCB and CSLB Solar Industry Updates

Chair Galarza introduced agenda item G, which concerns updates regarding the solar industry.

1. Presentation by California Contractors State License Board

Member Mark presented solar updates under agenda item G. He reported that solar complaints rose 108 percent from 2020 to 2023 but declined in 2024 for the first time since 2019, with 2025 projected to see an additional 18 percent decrease. Member Mark credited this progress to the creation of the Multiple Offender Unit, which has handled over 1,300 complaints and taken disciplinary action against licenses, as well as strong partnerships with agencies like the Public Utilities Commission. He commended CSLB staff for their consumer protection efforts in the solar industry.

Chair Galarza thanked Member Mark for the report and acknowledged the significant enforcement progress that has helped reduce solar complaints. He then introduced Josh Buswell-Charkow, the deputy director of the California Solar and Storage Association (CALSSA), inviting him to share comments with the Board.

Buswell-Charkow thanked the CSLB for the invitation and discussed the group's long partnership in educating members and addressing solar complaints. He discussed the decline in complaints and affirmed CALSSA's commitment to ongoing collaboration. Buswell-Charkow then explained recent changes to the federal investment tax credit (ITC), saying it is a tax credit, not direct payment, applied against income taxes, with separate provisions for residential and commercial systems. Residential systems fall



under Section 25-D, while commercial systems (including leases and PPAs) fall under Section 48. He said only eligible solar equipment qualifies, not unrelated costs like new roofs. Buswell-Charkow said the ITC previously ran through 2034 at 30 percent, but the new federal budget bill introduced changes. For residential projects, expenditures must be completed by December 31, 2025, to qualify. For commercial projects, the timeline is more complex, with rules tied to construction start dates, compliance with foreign entity sourcing requirements, and deadlines extending to 2027. Energy storage under commercial systems retains its credit through 2034.

Buswell-Charkow said many customers mistakenly believe signing a contract qualifies them for the credit, when in fact installation must be completed before the deadline. This could lead to consumer complaints. He stressed that CALSSA is educating members and urged customers to consult tax advisors. Buswell-Charkow said contractors are overwhelmed with demand as customers rush to secure credits before deadlines but said many in the industry are anxious about 2026, fearing higher costs, business closures, and stranded systems. He noted new insurance products and long-term equipment warranties as consumer protection, though service costs may still apply. Buswell-Charkow closed by reminding consumers to exercise due diligence, avoid misleading claims, and recognize solar as a valuable but significant investment.

Board Member Comment

There was no comment.

Public Comment

There was no comment.

2. Presentation by Nevada State Contractors Board

NSCB Chair Kent Lay introduced Luis Quesada, Director of Investigations.

Director Quesada discussed Senate Bill 379, which strengthens consumer protection in Nevada's solar industry. He noted complaint statistics: 212 new cases in 2024-2025, mostly involving workmanship issues, fraud, and misrepresentation. He said complaints have recently decreased by 15 percent, which he attributed to aggressive outreach, collaboration, and enforcement. Director Quesada detailed how SB 379 addresses these issues. Key provisions include limiting down payments to 10 percent or \$1,000 until final inspection or permission to operate, expanding rescission rights (3 days generally, 10 days for consumers over 60), and requiring on-site surveys instead of relying on satellite images. Installers must provide equal or better equipment substitutions at no added cost, and financiers cannot release final payments until a system is operational—otherwise, they assume responsibility.

The bill also tightens oversight of third-party lead generators by requiring clear disclaimers, banning false affiliations with utilities or government, and mandating that leads only be sold to licensed installers. Financial institutions must confirm contractor licensing and bid limits, record confirmation calls with consumers, and keep them for



five years, with recordings accessible to regulators within 10 days of request. Additional protections include background checks on solar employees, improved transparency in lease and tax-related disclosures, and mandatory first-year quality assurance, requiring installers to remedy underperforming systems. Consumers are also obligated to disclose property issues, such as roof problems, before installation. Director Quesada said SB 379 closes critical gaps in consumer protections, curbs deceptive practices, strengthens licensing enforcement, and ensures financial and transparency safeguards, placing Nevada ahead of many states in solar consumer protection.

Board Member Comment

There was no comment.

Public Comment

There was no comment.

H. Adjournment

NSCB Chair Lay thanked the California Board and staff for their collaboration and thanked Roadcamp and Hernandez for sharing their expertise. Chair Lay requested a motion to adjourn, which was seconded and approved, officially closing the Nevada meeting.

Chair Galarza expressed appreciation for the collaboration with Nevada and anticipated continued cooperative efforts. A motion to adjourn was made, seconded, and approved, officially closing the California meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.