



program it feels have been most successful and should be continued over the next two to five years; (2) those areas it believes should be discontinued or modified; and (3) enforcement actions taken during the past four to five years, as well as those anticipated in the next few years.

FUTURE MEETINGS:

To be announced.

CONTRACTORS STATE LICENSE BOARD

Registrar: John Maloney
(916) 366-5153

The Contractors State License Board (CSLB) licenses contractors to work in California, handles consumer complaints, and enforces existing laws pertaining to contractors.

The thirteen-member Board, consisting of seven public members, five contractors and one labor member, generally meets every other month. The Board maintains four committees: legislative, which monitors legislation affecting the Board; enforcement, which oversees enforcement of existing rules and regulations, including licensing requirements; licensing, which oversees the Board's licensing procedures; and administration/public information/liason, which oversees the Board's operations and public contact. Committees meet monthly, making recommendations to the full Board for requested action.

MAJOR PROJECTS:

Low Voltage Systems Contractor. Section 832, Title 16 of the California Administrative Code (CAC), classifies specialty contractors. CSLB has proposed an amendment which would add class C-7 (Low Voltage Systems Contractor) to the list of specialty contractors. Under proposed section 832.07, a communication and low voltage systems contractor is one who installs, services, and maintains all types of communication and low voltage systems which are energy-limited and do not exceed 91 volts. The proposal, which was amended after a hearing on October 22, is scheduled for a January 28 hearing at the Hotel Queen Mary in Long Beach.

Landscape Contractor Regulations. CSLB has proposed an amendment to section 832.27, Title 16 of the CAC, which would delete and replace current language which specifically describes tasks which landscape contractors may perform. According to CSLB, the amend-

ed provision would more accurately define the general work function allowed by the classification, thus eliminating the need to frequently revise the regulations as the technology of the trade evolves. The proposed amendment would also permit landscape contractors to subcontract to appropriately-licensed specialty contractors that work which may not be performed by a landscape contractor but which is essential to the completion of the landscape project. A hearing on the proposed amendment is scheduled for January 28 in Long Beach.

Unlicensed Contractor Workshop. CSLB conducted a workshop on October 21 to obtain testimony and information on the extent of the unlicensed contractor problem in California. (See CRLR Vol. 7, No. 4 (Fall 1987) p. 46.) Those present, including Board members and interested members of the industry, discussed ways to address the problem. Several proposals were presented, including one under which a trade association would be established to aid CSLB in enforcing laws against individuals who are operating as contractors without a license. CSLB committees have been directed to study the possibilities.

Implementing AB 1280 (Areias). This bill, which is now law (Chapter 1264, Statutes of 1987), gives CSLB authority to waive examinations for specified contractor classifications by regulation. At its November 17 meeting in San Francisco, the Licensing Committee recommended three criteria for determining whether an examination should be waived, including (1) health and safety concerns; (2) frequency of complaints against the classification; and (3) number of applicants per classification.

FUTURE MEETINGS:

To be announced.

BOARD OF COSMETOLOGY

Acting Executive Officer:

Denise Ostton
(916) 445-7061

In 1927 the California legislature passed Business and Professions Code section 7300 *et seq.*, establishing the Board of Cosmetology (BOC). The Board was empowered to require reasonably necessary precautions designed to protect public health and safety in establishments related to any branch of cosmetology.

Pursuant to this legislative mandate, the Board regulates and issues separate

licenses to salons, schools, electrologists, manicurists, cosmetologists, and cosmeticians. It sets training requirements, examines applicants, hires investigators from the Department of Consumer Affairs to investigate complaints, and disciplines violators with licensing sanctions.

The Board is comprised of seven members—four public members and three from the industry.

MAJOR PROJECTS:

Executive Officer's Report 86/87 Fiscal Year. At the Board's October 25 meeting, Acting Executive Officer Ostton informed the Board that the Combined Budget and Expenditures Report for the first eleven months of the 1986/87 fiscal year indicates that expenses for personal services and travel exceeded budget projections. However, that factor should be offset by underexpenditures in other areas. The year-end expenditure projection indicated the Board would spend approximately 97% of its \$3.1 million budget by June 30, 1987.

Ms. Ostton also informed the Board that three vacancies exist within the Board: Supervising Examiner, Inspector I, and Secretary. In addition, the number of Board licensees has increased overall by 5%.

Ms. Ostton stated that applicants currently wait an average of 39 days from submission of application to examination and, if successful, licensing. Hence, the waiting period has decreased, even though the number of applicants has increased.

Finally, the enforcement activities report showed that at the conclusion of the 1986/87 fiscal year, 118 fewer complaints were received than during the previous year.

Regulatory Changes. Following a December 13 hearing, the Board adopted a proposal to amend section 995, Chapter 9, Title 16 of the California Administrative Code, to establish an inactive license status for cosmetology instructors. At this writing, the rulemaking file is being compiled for submission to the Office of Administrative Law.

Statewide Pass/Fail Ratios for Instructors Exam. In response to concerns raised by many schools and applicants regarding the high failure rate for instructor applicants in southern California, the Board recently reviewed the pass/fail percentages from the instructors exam for the 1986/87 fiscal year. In order to address the apparent inconsistencies between northern and southern California scores, additional data is being developed in several areas. First, the