

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS for ROOFTOP SOLAR FINANCING

How State and Federal Governments Can Protect Consumers

Anneliese Lederer, Senior Policy Counsel
Andrew Kushner, Senior Policy Counsel

August 2025



About The Center for Responsible Lending (CRL)

The Center for Responsible Lending (CRL) is a non-partisan, nonprofit research and policy advocacy organization working to promote financial fairness and economic opportunity for all, end predatory lending, and close the racial wealth gap. CRL's expertise gives it trusted insight to evaluate the impact of financial products and policies on the wealth and economic stability of families of color, rural, women, military, low-wage, low-wealth, and early-career workers and communities. CRL is an affiliate of Self-Help, one of the nation's largest nonprofit community development financial institutions. We work in partnership with national and local consumer, faith, and civil rights organizations.

About the Authors

[Anneliese Lederer](#) is a Senior Policy Counsel at CRL. She is an expert on credit products and access to credit. She was previously the Director of Fair Lending and Consumer Protections at the National Community Reinvestment Coalition. As director, she created and led the small business matched-pair testing program. She co-authored two academic articles and a law review based upon small business testing and focused on access to credit for minority small business owners. She has been quoted in CNN and MarketWatch on a new mortgage product.

[Andrew Kushner](#) is a Senior Policy Counsel on CRL's state policy team, where he advises allies and lawmakers in California and other states regarding ending abusive lending practices at the state level. Prior to joining CRL, Andrew was an associate at a public interest law firm in San Francisco. Before that, he clerked for the Honorable Mariano-Florentino Cuéllar of the Supreme Court of California, as well as the Honorable Stephen Reinhardt of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge Michael Calhoun, Mitria Spotser, Al King, Ellen Harnick, Jim Overton, and Tracy Ward, each of whom provided helpful feedback and insight during the creation of this report.

We would like to thank Archetype Graphic Design & Writing Services, Inc. for their help in designing and formatting this report.

Contents

Introduction	4
State Recommendations	5
<i>Recommendations for Misrepresentations Related to Hidden “Dealer Fees”</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Recommendations for Misrepresentations Related to Tax Subsidies</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Recommendations for Misrepresenting Energy Output and Savings.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Recommendations for Issues with Other Bad Faith Sales and Installation Tactics</i>	<i>7</i>
Federal Recommendations	8
<i>Recommendations for Issues Related to Federal Tax Subsidies.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Recommendations for Misrepresentations Related to Hidden “Dealer Fees”</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Recommendations for Misrepresenting Energy Output and Savings.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Recommendations for Issues with Other Bad Faith Sales and Installation Tactics</i>	<i>11</i>
Conclusion.....	11
Endnotes	12

Introduction

To continue being a global economic leader, the United States needs access to reliable and robust energy sources. Without reliable and diverse sources of energy, the likelihood of a national security incident or a detrimental adverse economic event increases. One energy option that must be part of the mix is solar energy, which is captured both in large, utility-scale solar farms and through solar panels placed on the roofs of homes and businesses across the country.

Solar and other renewable energy sources can provide numerous benefits to homeowners, renters, and the nation, including lower utility bills, energy price stability, enhanced energy grid resilience, and reduced reliance on foreign sources of energy. Many homeowners who decide to get a solar rooftop system will finance it. Unfortunately, as documented in a Center for Responsible Lending (CRL) white paper, some

solar lenders and solar sales companies engage in multiple harmful or illegal practices.¹ Solar system purchasers are at risk because of these practices, which include false representations about the system's benefits and financing costs and terms, improper installation and connection of the system, failure to comply with consumer legal protections, and the use of contract clauses that block consumer redress for any of these acts. These problems may sometimes result in systems that do not produce sufficient savings to offset the costly monthly payments for the system.



Solar and other renewable energy sources can provide numerous benefits to homeowners, renters, and the nation, including lower utility bills, energy price stability, enhanced energy grid resilience, and reduced reliance on foreign sources of energy.

Improving consumer protection in this area has been one of the most pressing topics at statehouses across the country during the 2025 legislative session. Bills to improve protections for solar customers were introduced in California,² Connecticut,³ Massachusetts,⁴ New Mexico,⁵ New York,⁶ and Oregon,⁷ and such bills ultimately passed the legislature in Colorado,⁸ Montana,⁹ Nevada,¹⁰ Texas,¹¹ and Utah.¹² The most comprehensive of these bills is the legislation currently pending in California, which addresses, among other issues, the significant problems of hidden “dealer fees” and panels that are installed but not functioning.¹³



Improving consumer protection in this area has been one of the most pressing topics at statehouses across the country during the 2025 legislative session.

CRL continues to believe that both policymakers and regulators must protect solar finance consumers and legitimate solar and solar finance companies by enacting policies that create a safer, more transparent market. While this paper addresses recommendations for both state and federal policymakers and regulators, the current federal climate means that the states must take the lead on these issues in the near term. This paper's core recommendations for state regulators, which are described in greater detail below, are:

- States should require a specific “ability to repay” analysis for solar loans and limit the hidden upfront fees, known as “dealer fees,” that lenders often pass on to unsuspecting borrowers.
- States should enact rules specifically governing the representations that solar salespersons make to borrowers so that borrowers are not misled into agreeing to a solar system that costs more than and does not produce as much energy as promised.

State Recommendations:

Recommendations for Misrepresentations Related to Hidden “Dealer Fees”:

ISSUE: Large Hidden Financing Fees Are Often Included in Solar Loans

When solar rooftop systems are financed, some unscrupulous lenders charge a hidden financing fee by increasing the cash price by 25% or more. These are referred to as hidden “dealer fees.”

To combat this issue, state consumer protection authorities should:

- Cap the maximum amount of “dealer fees” lenders are allowed to charge. Using the principles of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau’s (CFPB) qualified mortgage rule, states should cap upfront fees, including “dealer fees,” at 3% of the principal amount, with an optional additional 2% permitted. States should also require that these dealer fees be applied to reduce the interest rate on the loan.

Recommendations for Misrepresentations Related to Tax Subsidies:

ISSUE: Misrepresentation of Tax Credit Harms Low- to Moderate-Income (LMI) Households

While tax credits have traditionally been a significant incentive for consumers to adopt solar energy, the federal government recently eliminated the federal income tax credit for rooftop solar installation, which will expire at the end of 2025. Several states have their own state tax incentives, but nearly all of these are

structured as non-refundable tax credits. The limitation of a non-refundable credit is that it only lowers a homeowner’s tax liability (the total taxes owed) and does not put money into a taxpayer’s pocket if they don’t have any (or sufficient) tax liability. A borrower with tax liability less than the amount of the tax credit will not be able to take full advantage of the credit, though in some cases the credit can be carried over to future years. Thus, a non-refundable tax credit will have limited to no benefit for low- to moderate-income (LMI) households, as these households do not have any (or a large enough) tax liability for this credit to be helpful. For example, Massachusetts and New York have non-refundable state tax credits, while South Carolina goes further and caps its non-refundable credit at \$3,500 regardless of the borrower’s tax liability.¹⁴



A non-refundable tax credit will have limited to no benefit for LMI households, as these households do not have any (or a large enough) tax liability for this credit to be helpful.

Over the last few years, misrepresentations related to the federal tax credit has been a major issue. Some unscrupulous lenders and installers misrepresent that tax credits would drastically lower the real cost of the system without knowing the tax liability of the consumer.

While the federal tax credit will shortly sunset, states should consider similar credits to encourage adoption of rooftop solar. Moreover, any states with a non-refundable state tax credit should ensure that unscrupulous lenders and installers do not apply the same unethical schemes to those credits. To combat the above harmful practices related to misrepresentations around the tax credit, these states should consider the following legislation:



While the federal tax credit will shortly sunset, states should consider similar credits to encourage adoption of rooftop solar.

- States should ensure that lenders are not using the tax credit to misrepresent the overall cost of, or monthly loan payments on, the system. For any loan for a product eligible for a tax credit, the lender must provide the borrower with clear, detailed information that includes, at a minimum, the following:
 - Borrowers will not receive the tax credit directly or as a deduction from the system sales price or loan amount but instead as a refund from the government after they file income tax returns for the year in which the installation takes place;
 - The tax credit is a non-refundable tax credit that only reduces a borrower's tax liability and, as such, may not provide the borrower with as much of a tax refund as anticipated; and
 - If homeowners are on government assistance programs or a fixed income, they may not receive any tax refund.

Recommendations for Misrepresenting Energy Output and Savings:

ISSUE: Calculations Regarding Energy Savings Over a Time Span of 20+ Years Are Inherently Speculative

During the sales pitch, a salesperson will often show the potential customer the projected monthly and yearly savings over the life of the panels, which is at least 20 years. However, energy output and savings are dependent on several factors, including the amount of shading the roof receives, the number and quality of the panels installed, and the times of day during which the potential customer uses the most



In the worst case scenario, consumers end up paying even more for energy than before solar panels were installed because they now owe money for their installation loan and a utility bill that remains high.

energy. In addition, some salespeople often base calculations about future savings on overly aggressive assumptions about how much energy costs will increase in the future. The net result is that some homeowners are misled into a financial transaction that either does not save them money, does not save them as much money as promised, or, in the worst case scenario, they end up paying even more for energy than before solar panels were installed because they now owe money for their installation loan and a utility bill that remains high. To combat these harmful practices, states should adopt the following state actions:

- Require that salespeople provide consumers with a good faith estimate of the projected electric bill savings from the solar energy system that the customer is expected to achieve. The salesperson must inform potential customers of all factors and calculations that go into the estimate, including, but not limited to, the amount of energy the system will generate, the homeowner's energy usage, and the assumed cost of energy during the relevant period. Salespeople must provide an estimate of energy savings over the first year of use based on the customer's current utility rates. This information should also include the monthly cost of the system (before any tax subsidy or balloon payment) and be provided to the customer in a physical form.

- For estimates of energy savings beyond the first year, policymakers and regulators should require that both salespeople and lenders be bound by the accuracy of such estimates. Promises of energy savings over a time span of 20 years or more are inherently speculative, principally because the rate of energy cost increases over that period is a great unknown. Thus, we recommend the inclusion of a production guarantee for the first five years of the contract between the lender and borrower and an acknowledgment that the guarantee is a material element of the contract. Once such calculations are made into material terms of the contract, borrowers would have a defense to repayment of the loan if those calculations proved to be inaccurate. Installers and lenders should be held liable for any misrepresentations in this area, and any attempt to have borrowers waive this liability in a contract should be deemed unenforceable.

Recommendations for Issues with Other Bad Faith Sales and Installation Tactics:

ISSUE: Fraudulent Sales Tactics Deceive Consumers

Some door-to-door salespeople employ fraudulent sales tactics to persuade consumers, particularly older consumers and minorities,¹⁵ to sign financing contracts. There have also been allegations of elder abuse and potential fair lending claims,¹⁶ as well as many reports of shoddy installers receiving full payment from the lender despite not installing the solar system completely and/or functionally.¹⁷

In many cases, existing legal authorities are sufficient to address these issues and simply must be enforced. Unfair, Deceptive, or Abusive Acts or Practices (UDAAP) and Unfair or Deceptive Acts or Practices (UDAP) are federal and state consumer protection laws to protect consumers from deceptive and abusive sales practices. Federal and state cooling off rules are another consumer protection category that allow consumers to cancel a door-to-door sales contract within at least three days of signing the contract without needing to provide a reason. However, there are instances when sales companies do not follow this rule and do not cancel the sales contract.



In many cases, existing legal authorities are sufficient to address these issues and simply must be enforced.

To combat these harmful practices, states should adopt the following state actions:

- State attorneys general should enforce right to rescind or cooling-off rules.
- State attorneys general should conduct enforcement actions under UDAP and UDAAP on misrepresentation in sales pitches.
- In circumstances where lenders and installers are affiliated, a borrower should be protected from having to make unaffordable payments until the system is generating electricity and thus helping the borrower save on their energy bill. In addition, lenders in those cases should be required to hold back a percentage of the loan principal from the contractor until the system is actually generating electricity.¹⁸
- States should permit solar panel systems to be installed only by licensed and bonded contractors with certification in this area.
- States should create or strengthen background consumer protections, such as safeguards against elder abuse and enforced limits on door-to-door sales practices.

Federal Recommendations:

Over the next few years, states' responsibilities to address consumer issues with solar installation and lending will be even more important, as the prospect for increased consumer protection activity from federal actors is remote. Since the change in the administration in January 2025, there has been a redirection within the federal government. First, the federal government has intentionally pulled back its oversight and enforcement activities. Second, there is a shift in focus away from addressing climate change and mitigating its effects.

Under the direction of the last administration, Congress passed The Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) of 2022. The IRA provided tax credits and grants to support the transition to other energy sources. The act also included specific measures to help bring these benefits to underserved communities, which includes LMI communities. Expanding LMI community access to solar energy is crucial to developing the nation's overall solar energy production.

On July 4, 2025, President Trump signed a reconciliation bill that directly impacts the solar industry by undoing dedicated funding and programs under the Inflation Reduction Act, including:

- Eliminating the 30% federal residential solar tax credit by December 31, 2025, which will deter consumers from purchasing this product;
- Introducing the Foreign Entity of Concern (FEOC) rules, which limit tax credit eligibility for projects using components or financing from countries such as China, Russia, Iran, and North Korea. Starting in 2026, projects that utilize excessive Chinese equipment may disqualify the project from receiving tax credits. This loss of the tax credit will increase the price of the equipment, resulting in no savings for consumers.
- Rescinding all unobligated funds for the Green and Resilient Retrofit Program. This program aimed to fund energy-efficient and climate-resilient upgrades to multifamily housing assisted by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). This change will disproportionately affect underserved communities.
- Terminating by June 30, 2026 the energy-efficient tax credit for builders of new homes that meet Energy Star standards, discouraging builders from utilizing these types of materials.
- Terminating by December 31, 2025 a tax credit for energy audits and renovations to improve efficiency.
- Phasing out tax credits for low-emission electricity source projects such as solar power. Projects must begin construction by July 4, 2026 or be placed in service by December 31, 2027 to qualify for the 45Y Production Tax Credit or 48E Investment Tax Credit.

In addition, this law reduces the CFPB's budget from 12% to 6.5% of the Federal Reserve Board's total operating expenses, which is one-third less than its current budget, thereby limiting the scope of CFPB's enforcement and regulatory actions.

Due to the adverse effects of the reconciliation bill on the solar industry, a revival of the solar industry will be necessary. At that time, governments, developers, and lenders need to listen to LMI community leaders when developing solar products, ensuring that products reaching the marketplace cater to the unique needs of these communities.



Governments, developers, and lenders need to listen to LMI community leaders when developing solar products, ensuring that products reaching the marketplace cater to the unique needs of these communities.

For example, individually owned rooftop solar may not work well for many LMI homeowners. Promising alternatives include partnerships between developers and LMI households to create community solar projects. Community solar projects are not predicated on consumers owning a house. Instead, both homeowners and renters can invest in these projects and receive a reduction in their energy costs. Another alternative is third-party-owned residential solar, which allows homeowners to lease the system (or purchase the energy produced) from the system owner. Both alternatives avoid the need for the homeowner to rely on a tax credit that they may not have sufficient tax liability to claim. Instead, the developer can receive a tax credit ranging from 30% to 50%, and in some cases, up to 70%, allowing the developer to provide affordable options for consumers. In many cases, structures like these make far more sense than individually owned rooftop solar systems.

Stakeholders should seize this opportunity to explore the development and implementation of special-purpose credit products tailored to this marketplace. In addition, to the extent that homeowners opt for rooftop solar systems, lenders participating in federal green lending programs should be required to provide clear, written notice to homeowners that they may be eligible for rebates and grant programs so that borrowing is a last resort, not a first option.

Lenders should provide contact information for relevant state and federal programs as well as referrals to free, reputable technical assistance providers that work with homeowners to determine program eligibility.

Lenders should also be required to conduct an “ability to repay” (ATR) analysis using the principles from the CFPB’s qualified mortgage rule, as the CFPB recently required in the context of PACE loans.¹⁹ This ATR analysis must account for circumstances unique to the solar lending context, including:

- Lenders cannot base an ATR analysis on the borrower’s receipt of a tax refund, absent a good-faith determination that the borrower will, in fact, obtain a refund (see below for more detail on the tax credit issue).
- Any estimates of energy savings must be based upon reasonable assumptions, which must be specifically disclosed to the borrower (see below for more details on the energy savings issue).
- Lenders must also determine whether the borrower has the ability to repay the loan during any period when loan payments are due but the system is not yet operational and generating energy (see below for additional details about the issue of timing loan payments).

CRL has the following additional recommendations for Congress and federal agencies to protect consumers. Although there is only a remote chance of these being enacted in the immediate term, advocates and stakeholders must lay the groundwork now.

Recommendations for Issues Related to Federal Tax Subsidies:

ISSUE: Current Federal Tax Credit Is Non-refundable and Has Limited Utility for LMI Communities

As noted above, the current federal tax credit is non-refundable, making it of limited utility for LMI communities. Only homeowners could utilize the credit, and even then, the homeowner must have sufficient tax liability for the credit to wipe out their tax liability (though the credit can be carried over to future years).

In addition, some lenders structure their loans with small, interest-only payments for the first 18 months of the loan term. To maintain affordable payments, borrowers must pay down 30% of the loan amount within those 18 months (with the idea being that borrowers use their large tax refund, due to the credit, to reach the 30% figure). When the large tax credit does not materialize for many borrowers, those borrowers are left with unaffordable payments for the remainder of the loan term.



When the large tax credit does not materialize for many borrowers, those borrowers are left with unaffordable payments for the remainder of the loan term.

- The federal tax credit should be reenacted to make solar energy accessible to all consumers, as not all states offer consumer tax credits.
- The federal tax credit should be refundable.

Recommendations for Misrepresentations Related to Hidden “Dealer Fees”:

ISSUE: Lenders May Mark Up the Cash Price of Solar Rooftop Systems by 25% or More

As described above, some lenders charge hidden fees when financing solar rooftop systems by marking up the cash price by 25% or more. These are called hidden “dealer fees.”

Finally, to tackle these issues, the federal government should take the following actions:

- Pursue enforcement actions against solar lenders for hiding “dealer fees” under the Truth in Lending Act (TILA), Equal Credit Opportunity Act, and the Dodd-Frank Act’s Unfair, Deceptive, or Abusive (UDAAP) prohibition.
- While TILA already requires disclosure of “dealer fees,”²⁰ to foreclose industry actors from claiming that their fees do not satisfy the definition and therefore do not need to be disclosed, the CFPB should issue guidance clarifying that the solar finance industry’s fees or other inducements to offer credit are not “seller’s points,” which are exempt from TILA disclosure.
- Many solar lenders are fintech companies that partner with chartered banks and credit unions to facilitate their loans. Regulators, in their supervisory capacity, should ensure that these institutions are not engaging in illegal activities under their duty to supervise third-party partners. Enforcement actions should also be pursued against lenders who fail to oversee their third-party partners properly.

Recommendations for Misrepresenting Energy Output and Savings:

ISSUE: Salespeople May Make Unduly Aggressive Assumptions Regarding Future Energy Cost Increases

As noted above, salespersons may misrepresent the solar system's output or likely energy savings, including by making unduly aggressive assumptions about future energy cost increases. Consumers may receive systems that are less beneficial than they anticipated and may even struggle to pay for their solar system loans along with their existing electricity bill.



Consumers may receive systems that are less beneficial than they anticipated and may even struggle to pay for their solar system loans along with their existing electricity bill.

To combat these harmful practices, we encourage the following federal actions:

- The federal government, through the Department of Energy, should provide yearly guidance on the percentage by which electricity has increased in each state so that salespeople have a more accurate number on which to base electrical savings over time.

Recommendations for Issues with Other Bad Faith Sales and Installation Tactics:

ISSUE: Deceptive Sales Tactics Harm Consumers

To combat harmful practices related to the deceptive sales tactics discussed above—including forged signatures and ignoring the Federal Trade Commission's (FTC) cooling-off rule—we encourage the following federal actions:

- The FTC should enforce its cooling-off rule.
- CFPB and FTC should conduct enforcement actions and issue joint guidance under UDAP and UDAAP on misrepresentation in financing and sales pitches.
- Federal agencies should conduct educational campaigns about consumer protection in connection with educational campaigns about solar lending.
- The CFPB should issue an arbitration rule to prevent consumers from being bound by harmful arbitration clauses that prohibit class action lawsuits.

Conclusion

Rooftop solar energy presents numerous benefits for individual homeowners and the nation. Unfortunately, however, the full promise of rooftop solar has been hindered by certain bad actors that have harmed the industry's reputation and injured consumers. CRL recommends that policymakers and regulators at both the state and federal levels enact the reforms discussed in this paper to ensure that responsible rooftop solar installation and financing is available for all.

Endnotes

The Shady Side of Solar System Financing, CRL (July 2024), available at <https://www.responsiblelending.org/research-publication/shady-side-solar-system-financing>

² CA Sen. Bill 784 (2025). Retrieved from https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=202520260SB784

³ CT House Bill 6052 (2025). Retrieved from https://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/cgabillstatus/cgabillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&bill_num=H-B06052&which_year=2025

⁴ MA Bill H.450 (2025). Retrieved from <https://malegislature.gov/Bills/194/HD4015>

⁵ NM SB 65 (2025). Retrieved from <https://www.nmlegis.gov/Legislation/Legislation?chamber=S&legtype=B&legno=65&year=25>

⁶ NY Bill S4124 (2025). Retrieved from <https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/bills/2025/S4124>

⁷ OR House Bill 3966 (2025). Retrieved from <https://olis.oregonlegislature.gov/liz/2025R1/Measures/Overview/HB3966>

⁸ CO Senate Bill 299 (2025). Retrieved from <https://leg.colorado.gov/bills/sb25-299>

⁹ MT House Bill 760 (2025). Retrieved from https://bills.legmt.gov/#/laws/bill/2/LC2324?open_tab=status

¹⁰ NV Senate Bill 379 (2025). Retrieved from <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/83rd2025/Bill/12675/Overview>

¹¹ TX Senate Bill 1036 (2025). Retrieved from <https://capitol.texas.gov/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=89R&Bill=SB1036>

¹² UT House Bill 57 (2025). Retrieved from <https://le.utah.gov/~2025/bills/static/HB0057.html>

¹³ See CA Senate Bill 784, note 2, *supra*.

¹⁴ South Carolina has a state tax credit in the amount of 25% of the installation cost of a solar system that is separately limited in that taxpayers may only claim \$3,500 in any one tax year (they can roll over the balance). Thus, a taxpayer who spent \$30,000 on a system (resulting in \$7,500 tax credit) would be able to exhaust the credit only after three years. See SC Tax Form SC SCH.TC-38, available at <https://dor.sc.gov/forms-site/Forms/TC38.pdf>

¹⁵ Semuels, Alana. *Titan Solar, One of the Largest Residential Solar Installers, Files for Bankruptcy*. (2024, June 18). Time. Retrieved from <https://time.com/6989810/titan-solar-closing>; Semuels, Alana, *The Rooftop Solar Industry Could Be on the Verge of Collapse*. (2024, May 28). Time. Retrieved from <https://time.com/6565415/rooftop-solar-industry-collapse/>; *Jones v. Solgen Construction, LLC*, No. F085918, 2024 WL (Cal. Ct. App. Feb. 2, 2024). *Clayton Co. woman says salesman tricked her into getting costly solar panels for her home*. (2024). WSB-TV Atlanta. Retrieved from <https://www.wsbtv.com/news/local/clayton-county/clayton-co-woman-says-salesman-tricked-her-into-getting-costly-solar-panels-her-home/56CUNFJNYJBRVNKELEHVRTIHH4/>; *Tennessee, ex rel. Skremetti v. Ideal Horizon Benefits, LLC*, 2023 WL 4706991 (E.D. Tenn. 2023); State of Minnesota Attorney General's Office. (2024). Complaint in [State of Minnesota v GoodLeap LLC, Sunlight Financial LLC, Solar Mosaic LLC, and Dividend Solar Finance LLC.] (Docket No. 2024cv01181). Retrieved from <https://www.ag.state.mn.us/Office/Communications/2024/docs/SolarLending>

¹⁶ Lucia, A., Salazar, L., & Fralicks, S. (2024, February 8). Texas Solar Company Accused of Preying on Elderly Signs Deal with Federal Government. (2024, February 8.) Retrieved from <https://www.cbsnews.com/texas/news/texas-solar-company-accused-of-preying-on-elderly-signs-deal-with-federal-government/>

¹⁷ See *supra* note 14.

¹⁸ This recommendation is limited to circumstances where a lender and installer have a joint sales relationship because it incentivizes lenders to carefully choose the installers with which to partner. If borrowers are simply obtaining a loan independently and choosing an installer independently, it's less logical to make the lender responsible for the installer's work.

¹⁹ <https://www.consumerfinance.gov/rules-policy/final-rules/residential-property-assessed-clean-energy-financing-regulation-z/>

²⁰ At a minimum, the lender must inform the borrower about the existence and amount of the dealer fee. Absent such disclosure, there is no possible argument that the "seller's points" exemption applies.



Center for Responsible Lending

www.responsiblelending.org

The Center for Responsible Lending (CRL) is a non-partisan, nonprofit research and policy advocacy organization working to promote financial fairness and economic opportunity for all, end predatory lending, and close the racial wealth gap. CRL's expertise gives it trusted insight to evaluate the impact of financial products and policies on the wealth and economic stability of families of color, rural, women, military, low-wage, low-wealth, and early-career workers and communities. CRL is an affiliate of Self-Help, one of the nation's largest nonprofit community development financial institutions. We work in partnership with national and local consumer, faith, and civil rights organizations.

North Carolina

302 West Main Street
Durham, NC 27701
Ph (919) 313-8500
Fax (919) 313-8595

California

1970 Broadway
Suite 350
Oakland, CA 94612
Ph (510) 379-5500
Fax (510) 893-9300

District of Columbia

910 17th Street NW
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20006
Ph (202) 349-1850
Fax (202) 289-9009