



CONTRACTORS STATE LICENSE BOARD

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY REPORT

Legislative Committee Meeting Summary Report

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

Legislative Committee Chair Joël Barton called the meeting of the Contractors State License Board (CSLB) Legislative Committee to order on September 18, 2024, at 1:00 p.m. at CSLB Headquarters in Sacramento, CA, via Webex teleconference. A quorum was established.

Committee Members Present

Joël Barton, Chair
Rodney Cobos
Miguel Galarza
Amanda Gallo
Diana Love
Thomas Ruiz

CSLB Staff Present

David Fogt, Registrar
Michael Jamnetski, Chief Deputy Registrar
Steve Grove, Chief of Enforcement
Rebecca May, Chief of Legislation
Jason Perez, Chief of Information Technology
Katherine White, Chief of Public Affairs
Tracy Brazil, Regulation Manager
Amy Lawrence, Television Specialist
Natalie Rosenberger, Information Officer
Natalie Watmore, Information Officer
Robin Williams, Executive Analyst

Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) Staff Present

John Kinn, DCA Legal Counsel
Yvonne Dorantes, Assistant Deputy Director, DCA Board and Bureau Relations

B. Public Comment Session for Items Not on the Agenda and Future Agenda Item Requests

Chair Joël Barton explained that this agenda item was intended for items not on the agenda. Chair Barton asked participants to refrain from sharing specific details of their cases as it may jeopardize the Board's investigation and enforcement efforts. Chair Barton also noted enforcement staff were present at the meeting to meet individually with any consumers that may have complaint related concerns.

Andrea Montano commented on behalf of the "Scammed by Anchored Tiny Homes"



Facebook group, which represents customers, employees, contractors, and franchisees who say they have been defrauded of \$30 million. The commenter noted having been scammed in 2021 and that their case before CSLB had been resolved. They expressed hope that this meeting will help local district attorneys, local law enforcement, FBI and other entities help resolve the issues allegedly caused by Anchored Tiny Homes and provide swift justice.

Attorney Amy Pierce asked the Board to agendize a Second District Court of Appeal (Court) case decision they believe is contradictory to positions CSLB has taken and maintained for many years. The commenter noted that the Court determined a contractor's license was not required for a window coverings installer who installed over \$30,000 worth of window coverings because the window coverings were removeable. The commenter stated this decision was contrary to CSLB's view regarding the installation of home improvement goods, given most home improvement or home remodeling items are removeable. They further stated the Court disregarded the Board's licensing classifications – C-61 – Limited Specialty and D-52 – Window Coverings –and noted the Court seemed to endorse the idea that an unlicensed contractor could solicit bids, solicit contractors to review the bid, review the work, and direct the homeowner to pay the subcontractor or unlicensed contractor directly. Lastly, the commenter noted the Court was lenient because the unlicensed contractor referred to themselves as an interior decorator instead of a contractor or subcontractor.

Chair Barton asked the commenter to make their request in writing to the Board.

Kathy Winn commented that California recently made ADU grants available and inquired if additional grants were planned to help consumers.

Chair Barton asked the commenter to make their request in writing to the Board.

Vivian Wong commented they had filed a complaint regarding their swimming pool. The commenter stated the initial contractor issue was resolved through arbitration; however, the second contractor hired to finish the repairs had abandoned the project. The commenter noted CSLB is in the process of closing the complaint, but they would like it reviewed further.

DCA Counsel John Kinn asked the commenter not to discuss specific details of pending complaints, as only part of the board is present and they cannot hear specifics. They let the commenter know an enforcement staffer can reach out to discuss the case.

Wong again asked the Board not to close their case and noted that the procedure for filing a complaint against a contractor with a suspended license was unclear. They also stated the Board's industry expert report provided numbers with insufficient justification for what was included and asked for more transparency to protect consumers.

Richard Markuson, on behalf of the Western Electrical Contractors Association, Plumbing, Heating and Cooling Contractors of California, the American Fire Sprinkler Association and the Independent Roofing Contractors of California, commented that the enactment of Assembly Bil 2622 (Carrillo) deregulating construction projects under \$1,000 has caused a variety of loopholes in other code sections and triggers a variety of



requirements for licensed contractors for projects over \$500. The commenter requested CSLB consider proposing legislation for inclusion in next year's Senate Business, Professions, and Economic Development Committee's omnibus bill to correct these inconsistencies.

Chair Barton recommended the commenter send his comment in writing to the Legislation Chief.

Connie Arnold, a disability rights advocate, stated it is problematic that the "Find my Contractor" function on the Board's website does not have a category for contractors specializing in residential home renovations for persons with disabilities. The commenter noted all contractors should understand these types of jobs, but certain contractors specialize in this type of work. The commenter expressed concern regarding bond requirements for ADU dwellings, saying it would make ADUs more cost prohibitive for homeowners with disabilities or families with a disabled family member. Lastly, the commenter stated that Government Code Section 4459 related to the State Architect maintaining building codes needs updating to enhance accessibility given recent technological changes.

Chair Barton asked the commenter to make her request in writing to the Board.

Carlos Lubiano expressed support for added protections for subcontractors when contractors do not pay their wages. The commenter noted being owed money by a builder and that placing a lien on a property is not fair to the property owner that has already paid the general contractor.

C. Discussion Regarding Anchored Tiny Homes Complaints and Possible Legislative Concepts

Chair Barton noted the purpose of the meeting is for the committee to hear feedback from the public regarding laws applicable to licensed contractors engaging in residential construction, whether it is home improvement or the construction of single-family dwellings. Chair Barton asked Registrar David Fogt to explain the Board's role in protecting consumers through home improvement contracting laws and to provide background information on legislative concepts identified by staff.

Registrar Fogt thanked the public for attending the meeting and noted attendees have filed complaints regarding a contractor that has not completed projects, taken a significant amount of money, and failed to complete their contracts. The Registrar stated that public protection is the Board's highest priority, and they look forward to hearing the public's suggestions on legislative improvements. The Registrar stated CSLB staff is taking note of the suggestions offered and there is no need to send suggestions in writing.

Registrar Fogt explained that ADUs can be a conversion of a garage, or an attic into an apartment, and noted that some meeting attendees contracted for an ADU in a residentially zoned area on their property that is not directly connected to the existing structure. The Registrar explained that a licensed contractor performing home improvement work is restricted to a \$1,000 deposit and cannot receive payments



greater than the value of work and materials provided. The Registrar stated that Business and Professions Code Section 7164 relating to new home construction does not restrict payments, allowing the contractor to be paid upfront for new home construction presumably because the Legislature determined a new home build does not need the same level of protection as remodeling an existing structure. The Registrar noted that building departments often consider ADUs to be new construction for fee assessment purposes, and there may be a need to clarify that an ADU is not new home construction for CSLB consumer protection and enforcement purposes. The Registrar further explained that per the Government Code an ADU is a living facility attached or detached on the same property and is considered home improvement for CSLB administrative purposes. The Registrar asked attendees to consider whether further clarification is needed that an ADU not directly attached to an existing structure is home improvement. The Registrar noted a clarification may be needed for criminal cases but not necessary to hold a contractor accountable for violating administrative law.

Registrar Fogt explained that contractors essentially grant credit to customers by accepting a \$1,000 deposit and not receiving additional payments greater than the work already performed or until the entire job is completed. The Registrar noted individuals attending the meeting had made significant payments for incomplete construction work and did not receive plans or permits. The Registrar further noted that contractors can take full payment up front if they secure a payment or performance bond which very few contractors do.

Registrar Fogt emphasized that CSLB has administrative authority over contractors, establishing qualifications for licensees and administratively disciplining a licensed contractor, including the revocation of a license. The Registrar further stated that payment violations, abandonment, not completing a contract, and misuse of funds are grounds for license revocation. The Registrar noted administrative violations can often also be referred to a local district attorney for criminal prosecution. The Registrar reminded meeting attendees to comment only in general terms regarding investigations, so any cases referred to district attorneys are not compromised but noted that enforcement staff were available to talk to attendees directly.

Registrar Fogt explained Penal Code Section 484b is commonly investigated at CSLB and if a contractor requested money for a construction project and that money went elsewhere or didn't go toward the construction project, may constitute a violation of Penal Code 484b. The Registrar further noted that they cannot give legal advice or discuss bankruptcy law but found an informative document online titled "Bankruptcy Basics" regarding federal bankruptcy code.

Registrar Fogt explained that limited liability corporations (LLCs) are required to have an additional \$100,000 bond, in addition to each contractor having a \$25,000 bond; however, the LLC bond is limited to employees and workers and not consumers. The Registrar noted that in the event a contractor has taken money and not performed the work, liability insurance does not help as it only covers property damage.

Registrar Fogt noted that the law encourages consumers and contractors to get a payment and performance bond as they ensure subcontractors are paid and work is



completed per the contract specifications. However, the Registrar noted these types of bonds are uncommon because they add 2 to 4 percent to the contract price.

Registrar Fogt pointed out that many states have a recovery fund funded by licensed contractors upon license renewal. The Registrar stated they learned licensees in states with recovery funds pay approximately \$300 every two years. Registrar Fogt noted California licensed contractors have expressed concern they would rather not pay more for their renewals and accordingly California does not have a recovery fund. Lastly, Registrar Fogt stated that most contractors do a great job and while a recovery fund means the good contractors will pay for the bad ones, it would provide an avenue for consumers to seek restitution.

Registrar Fogt asked the meeting attendees to provide their comments and additional ideas.

Chair Barton asked legislative committee members if they had any comments.

Committee Member Comment

There was no Committee Member comment.

Public Comment

Andrea Montano stated that raising bond amounts proportionally to liability insurance amounts would be better than raising bond requirements from \$25,000 to another minimum amount. The commenter suggested larger companies with millions of dollars in liability should have surety bonds proportional to that liability. They further suggested periodic reviews of financials to ensure licensees are meeting the criteria. They expressed support for enhancing financing laws by requiring construction loans be held in escrow and payments to be monitored by a third party. They also noted that consumers who are provided with funds directly from a home equity line of credit (HELOC) and other loans may not question handing over the money to the contractors. Lastly, Montano stated that tightening financial laws would better protect consumers who are taking out ADU loans or borrowing against their 401ks.

Joseph Peretz, owner of an ADU company, noted there are many good ADU contractors and putting payment or performance bonds on every ADU would solve the problem but said these bonds are very expensive and difficult to apply for, especially for small and medium contractors. They expressed support for a recovery fund and suggested it be funded by paying an additional \$100 per ADU permit pulled from local building officials. The commenter also expressed support for an ADU-specific license type with different bonding terms and limits to the number of ADUs that can be built under that license. Peretz also stated that a separate license will make it more challenging to enter the profession and prevent individuals from scamming homeowners through advertising.

Christopher Peterson expressed concerns about homeowners having liens placed against their homes by workers who have not been paid, despite the homeowner having paid the general contractor. The commenter suggested large project payments be



placed into an escrow account and subcontractors can place a lien against the escrow account instead of against the homeowner.

Douglas Wasborn shared concerns regarding banks rejecting consumer fraud claims because the bank determines the consumer authorized an ACH transfer and closes the claim without any investigation. They stated laws should be amended with respect to the 60 or 90-day rule to put a claim on an ACH payment, because the determination of fraud comes much later and homeowners have no legal recourse to get money back from a contractor.

Janine Carol inquired if CSLB has referred Anchored Tiny Homes to the district attorney's office. DCA Counsel John Kinn responded that the Legislative Committee is unable to discuss ongoing investigations to protect consumers who file complaints by keeping their identities confidential. Counsel confirmed that CSLB regularly cooperates with law enforcement on these types of investigations. Carol shared concern for homeowners paying twice for a subcontractor when the general contractor fails to pay them. They acknowledged that the subcontractor doesn't want to file a lien but deserves to be paid. Carol also stated the Board is slow to protect the public, saying people lost significant money in June and July and CSLB was already aware of the issue at that time.

Katie Lucas expressed concerns regarding the lack of communication between customers and subcontractors. They suggested a law requiring the subcontractor to advise the homeowner of not being paid within 30 days so all parties can determine who needs to be paid and why it happened.

Laura Zanucchi stated they were scammed by Anchored Tiny Homes for \$40,000. They noted the current bond requirements do not address the level of liability a large-scale company holds and said the law provides no solution for long term fraud. Zanucchi agreed that not all licensed contractors' bonds should be increased but said there should be equitability, and companies signing up hundreds of customers for projects totaling of \$100 million should not have a \$25,000 bond. They expressed support for a separate ADU license type as it would provide stricter monitoring of contracts and marketing practices. Zanucchi also stated they are sensitive to new contractors taking on additional burden, but they support the establishment of a recovery fund, noting it is the top solution suggested by the Facebook group called "Scammed by Anchored Tiny Homes."

Jason Comerford expressed concerns regarding subcontractors and material suppliers not having responsibility for being paid by primary contractors, noting subcontractors continue to work for a significant amount of time beyond when they have outstanding invoices generating additional cost for homeowners. They stated a wood supplier attached a lien to their property and the supplier's standard practice was to be paid 30 to 60 days past due. Comerford stated this process inherently creates the risk of not being paid but said the wood supplier did not accept any risk because they attached a property lien. They questioned what risk or responsibility the subcontractor or material supplier bears for continuing to work or provide supplies to a contractor who has not paid them for a significant period of time.



Kate Brolin stated they found the Board's complaint process arduous, both for their complaint regarding Anchored Tiny Homes and a prior complaint regarding a person with a fake contractor's license. They stated it took CSLB over a year to notify them that there was nothing the Board could do for the prior complaint. They noted other complaints getting attached to the bond that is not going to appear. Brolin further stated that the timeframe for complaints is too long, and they don't understand why the board did not understand how bad this situation was, noting they contacted the Board in February or March when they were financially injured.

Chair Barton announced a 15-minute break for the Legislative Committee to compile the suggestions that have been provided. They shared gratitude for everyone's contributions and noted having studied the issue, reviewed media clips, and read documents. Chair Barton stated that on behalf of the Board they are distressed by the issue and emphasized the Board's commitment to addressing it. They also expressed appreciation for the media's coverage and assured attendees that the Board would take their suggestions seriously.

DCA Counsel John Kinn clarified that Chair Barton was speaking on behalf of the Legislative Committee, not the entire Board. Counsel strongly recommended consumers interested in bankruptcy remedies or payment and performance bond remedies to seeking legal counsel.

Recess at 2 p.m. for 15 minutes.

Reconvened at 2:15 p.m.

Chair Barton expressed gratitude to the public for their attendance, both in person and via Webex, and asked Registrar Fogt to summarize the discussion so far.

Registrar Fogt provided a summary of the suggestions provided at the meeting. They stated staff may want to examine why banks no longer require an escrow account and requiring an escrow officer to determine if the work was done before authorizing payment. Registrar Fogt noted in some situations banks are directly paying contractors, which puts consumers at considerable risk if the work is not completed. However, in this situation, the Registrar noted that homeowners may have received a loan and turned it over to the contractor because they lacked information on how to protect themselves.

Registrar Fogt asked the Board to explore establishing a recovery fund by holding a public meeting to determine construction industry input and potential opposition. The Registrar stated that CSLB is not in the bond business, nor is it a surety company, but does require licensees to carry a bond, and the Registrar would ask the surety companies to meet with the Board. They also noted attendee input regarding making bonding requirements commensurate with the amount of work being done to provide better protection. Registrar Fogt expressed wanting to know the position of surety companies on increasing surety bonds and what those costs would be.

Registrar Fogt noted a suggestion to establish a distinct licensing classification for the construction of ADUs and said the Board's examination unit will consider it. They also noted concerns expressed regarding mechanics liens when material suppliers and



subcontractors are not paid putting consumers at risk of paying twice. Registrar Fogt also noted mechanics lien law is in the California constitution and that CSLB's website has information on mechanics liens.

Registrar Fogt acknowledged concerns regarding investigations and stated CSLB's goal is to perform investigations in a timely manner. They noted their appreciation for consumers filing complaints so the Board can effectively regulate the construction industry.

Registrar Fogt also noted that ADUs on residential property should be clarified as home improvement. They noted CSLB's definition of home improvement includes all home improvement on or adjacent to a dwelling, and that like a swimming pool, ADUs are not directly attached to a house. Registrar Fogt provided a recent example where consumer protection in declared disaster areas was enhanced by the payment restrictions by including reconstruction in declared disaster areas to the definition of home improvement.

Public Comment

John Orison expressed support for the creation of a specialized classification for ADU contractors and shared concerns regarding how experienced licensed contractors would qualify for a new classification. They also asked why licensed contractors are not required to meet periodic requalifying requirements like other licensed professions.

"Leo" agreed with the previous speaker's comments and noted if bonds are required for ADUs, it would address the issue after harm has already occurred. They expressed support for a preventative approach instead. They said they had fallen victim to a contractor who controlled the funding and noted that fund control should be overseen by a private entity instead of the contractor.

Ryan O'Connell, representing the "How To ADU" Facebook community with 90,000 California homeowners trying to build ADUs, shared appreciation that this issue is being taken seriously. The commenter noted that the system generally works well and cautions that any solution doesn't harm "happy path" ADU projects more than it helps "unhappy path" ADU projects. They noted regulations such as requiring separate or specialized licensing will increase costs and lower the number of providers. O'Connell asked participants to consider if the solutions being offered would have saved homeowners from harm in this situation. They found clarifying the definition of home improvement interesting and noted financial oversight is difficult given the common use of cash deals and HELOC loans for ADUs. Lastly, they advised CSLB to talk to CalHFA about how they managed construction escrow for the grants administered last year.

Mark Allen asked how CSLB polices regulate licensed contractors whose businesses go under but later open another business with a different license.

Chair Barton asked the commenter to provide their information so enforcement staff can respond. They stated that CSLB has enforcement officers to police projects.

N. Roland commented that they were building an ADU on their property and paid the



contractor per the terms of the contract. Roland stated they trusted the salesman and the company and checked with the Better Business Bureau, Yelp, Google, and CSLB's website. Roland stated they lost \$90,000 and that they would have appreciated if CSLB had a simple step-by-step tip sheet to assist in the process. They stated they never would have signed the contract had they known the contract was asking them pay too much upfront. Roland expressed support for a law requiring contractors to follow a certain contract and for CSLB to make this information easily accessible on its website. Lastly, in response to CSLB's encouragement to find a bankruptcy lawyer, they noted hiring a lawyer costs \$5,000 and is unfeasible given they had to pay an extra \$5,000 for permits despite having already paid for them.

Chair Barton noted having spoken with the Legislation Chief about this earlier and agreed CSLB needs to get the word out to protect consumers.

"Mike" commented regarding his experience with a contractor who warned him that CSLB was ineffective. The commenter stated they involved an Assemblymember who got CSLB to reopen their case after it was closed. They stated CSLB would not reopen all 85 victims' cases but did reopen three of them. The commenter noted that their damages were over \$400,000 and they served as a witness for the CSLB in its administrative hearing against the contractor. While CSLB was successful in getting the contractor's license revoked, the commenter noted the contractor would be able to reinstate their license in three years by paying \$20,000 in court fees despite having caused over \$400,000 in damages. They expressed concerns that the revocation was not permanent and that CSLB was no help in getting the case referred to law enforcement for criminal prosecution. They believe a consumer should never have a lien placed against their property by a subcontractor they did not hire. Lastly, the commenter noted that they would appreciate CSLB's assistance in getting restitution and having their case referred to the district attorney's office.

Katherine Phillips, an alleged victim of Multitaskr, noted they had taken on loans suggested by the builder and the loan funds were transferred directly to the builder who failed to build an ADU. They stated that before the work was finished one of the loans expired and would have had excessive fees on expiration, so they took out a second loan to pay off the first loan at the builder's suggestion. They further stated that they were forced to refinance their mother-in-law's home to pay the loan off before maturity causing the house payment to increase from \$900 to \$3,500 a month. Phillips noted the negative "domino effect" of paying off a loan before the ADU was built, and they are unable to get the loan company to forgive the original loan because it has already been paid for a structure that was never built.

Sydney Brown asked for clarity regarding the classification of ADUs as home improvements when an ADU is added to a property that has a duplex. They stated they are trying to get insurance, and the insurance company views the ADU as separate from main home because it has a separate address.

Chair Barton asked the commenter to put their contact information into the chat and staff would respond.



Amy Pierce raised concerns about the challenges faced by victims of unlicensed contractors in the court system and stated that Business and Professions Code Section 7045 is being used as a shield. They remarked that CSLB is doing the right thing in citing unlicensed contractors but noted that coordination between the district attorney's office and the courts is imperative to ensure justice for victims. Lastly, Pierce noted that recent interpretations of BPC Section 7045 exempting unlicensed contractors from licensure requirements disinclines courts and juries to punish unlicensed contractors as the law is intended.

Douglas Wasborn shared concerns regarding lien warnings issued by suppliers, noting there are no legal requirements to warn the consumer of any outstanding balances before issuing the lien. Wasborn said they were assured by the supplier's staff not to worry about the general contractor paying on time and that the supplier was unable to provide periodic outstanding balance information. They expressed support for requiring suppliers to report account balances to the customer if they are allowed to issue a lien so the consumer can take corrective action with the general contractor.

"Vito," a former employee/subcontractor for Anchored Tiny Homes, stated they are owed a couple hundred thousand dollars for unpaid work. They shared interest in changes to how general contractors hire subcontractors. They expressed support for increasing existing bond requirements or requiring performance bonds on projects, noting that \$25,000 is insufficient, especially with multiple subcontractors claiming a portion of the bond. The commenter stated that they are receiving \$12,000 for their loss of \$200,000 in unpaid work. They would like bond requirements to be like general liability insurance requirements, with audits to show the contractor's potential exposure to liability.

Katie Lucas expressed concerns regarding the posting of complaints on the CSLB website and notes that there were previously no Anchored Tiny Homes complaints because the company would pay customers to withdraw their complaints. They stated that Anchored Tiny Homes offered them \$19,000 to remove their complaint from CSLB's website which they took issue with because the negotiated agreement might have contained terms requiring them to remove their complaint and for the contractor to compensate them. They noted that removing complaints from CSLB website diminishes consumer protection because if there had been evidence of a complaint consumers would not have continued to hire them.

Andrea Montano thanked CSLB for their efforts to address the Anchored Tiny Homes accusations. The commenter noted having worked in state government for 20 years in fraud detection and prevention and said it is difficult to get information across to consumers when there is bureaucratic red tape. They expressed their belief that CSLB has investigated these cases. Montano further noted that a third-party permit coordinator, hired by the contractor unbeknownst to their customers, is now holding permits because the contractor did not pay them despite the customers having paid for permits. They noted that a memorandum with cities and counties would be helpful to put permits back into the homeowners' names so homeowners can find a new general contractor and move forward. Montano also expressed concern regarding the CSLB's



website only showing ten complaints, despite more than 200 complaints being investigated. They say they understand it wouldn't be feasible to post all 200 but said it would be helpful for district attorneys and the Office of the Attorney General to know the volume of complaints filed. Montano also asked for better collaboration between state agencies including the Secretary of State and the Franchise Tax Board, so that in addition to revoking the contractor's license, their business license might be sanctioned.

Jan Kaufman expressed gratitude to the organizers of the meeting, particularly thanking Andrea and Katie for their efforts in creating resources for those affected by the Anchored Tiny Homes accusations.

Katherine Peoples, executive director of HPP Cares, a nonprofit organization in Southern California that administers California HFA ADU Grant funds, noted HPP Cares is U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) approved and manages thousands of ADU projects statewide providing outreach, underwriting, and managed escrow services. Peoples stated their organization has warned clients about Anchored Tiny Homes and has only lost minimal grant funds due to their fund control and management. They stated that their organization is the solution to managed escrow, and that they monitor and manage construction companies, provide education, verify licensure and manage funds.

Gabriela Sandoval from HPP Cares stated that as a HUD housing counselor, their focus is on educating homeowners regarding buying and maintaining their homes. They noted that homeowners may know how to access grants and loans, but don't know how to manage the complexities of construction, including average construction costs, realistic timelines, payment phases, bonds, managed escrow, and the roles of subcontractors. They remarked that basic knowledge of these topics can help homeowners make informed decisions and avoid common mistakes in the construction process. Lastly, Sandoval noted that better-informed homeowners will not only better manage their projects financially but will be able to complete their projects with less stress.

Chair Barton thanked the Committee members and public for sharing their thoughtful feedback. They stated committee members and CSLB staff will further research and vet ideas and submit concepts to the full board for consideration at a future meeting. They noted the Board will then determine which ideas might be crafted into legislative proposals. Chair Barton noted his appreciation to the public for their input and will continue to ensure future opportunities for the public to participate in this process.

DCA Counsel John Kinn stated consumer protection is what CSLB does, and it cannot act without homeowners and complainants bringing these issues to the attention of CSLB. They noted that the public's input helps CSLB get ideas to further educate the public and weed out some of the bad actors. Kinn also clarified that while some mentioned financial injury, CSLB is a statutory entity that upholds minimum standards for construction workers and relies on the public to administratively discipline bad actors. They noted CSLB does not have the ability to collect financial injury claims directly and reassured attendees that their concerns are being taken seriously and will be brought to the board's attention for further consideration.



CSLB

COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

D. Adjournment

Committee Chair Barton adjourned the meeting at 3:02 p.m.