FILED
JUN 09 2026
NEVADA COMMISSION FOR
COMMON INTEREST COMMUNITIES
AND CONDOMINIUM HOTELS

June 9, 2026

Commission for Common-Interest Communities and Condominium Hotels
Nevada Real Estate Division
3300 W. Sahara Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89102

Re: Ombudsman Report, Confidentiality, and Commission Oversight

Chair and Commissioners:

I submit this letter regarding the Ombudsman Report included in the supporting materials for the June 9, 2026 Commission meeting.

The report provides workload information. It identifies the number of registered associations, units, filings, audits, intervention affidavits, ADR claims, education activity, and broad categories of alleged issues.

That information may be useful background. But workload is not the Commission's central concern. The Commission does not administer the Division's day-to-day operations, control NRED staffing, or appropriate funding. The Commission's role is regulatory, adjudicatory, and policy-oriented. For those purposes, the report provides very little meaningful information.

The report tells the Commission how many matters moved through the Division. It does not meaningfully tell the Commission what the Division learned, what legal issues recur, what corrective action was required, whether similar issues are treated consistently, whether repeat associations or managers are involved, or whether informal resolutions are producing meaningful compliance.

That distinction matters.

If the Ombudsman Report is the principal public disclosure the Commission receives regarding Division activity, then the Commission is being asked to evaluate Nevada's common-interest community system with little more than a workload summary. Case counts are not oversight. Closure labels are not accountability. A category such as "Division Resolved Allegations" tells the public almost nothing unless the Commission is also told, at least in redacted or anonymized form, what was resolved, why it was resolved, and what corrective action was required.

This concern is heightened by the Division's apparent application of NRS 116.757. I recognize that NRS 116.757 establishes confidentiality for certain investigative information. I am not asking the Division to disclose confidential investigative files, personal information, unproven allegations, or the identities of complainants.

But the Division appears to read confidentiality so broadly that the Commission and public receive almost no meaningful information about closed or informally resolved matters. That

reading may protect files, but it also prevents the Commission from seeing the legal and regulatory patterns it needs to see.

Confidentiality may justify withholding names and investigative materials. It should not be used to withhold all meaningful public information about recurring legal issues, closure rationales, corrective action, and enforcement outcomes.

The Commission, lawmakers, associations, managers, and homeowners would benefit from a second layer of reporting: anonymized enforcement and closure summaries. The current system leaves homeowners and associations guessing. Owners do not know what conduct the Division considers actionable. Boards and managers do not know what practices have repeatedly resulted in correction. Lawmakers cannot see where statutory ambiguity or recurring noncompliance exists. The Commission cannot evaluate whether informal resolution is being used consistently or whether serious issues are being diverted from public review.

This is especially important if the Division continues to rely heavily on informal resolution, letters of instruction, termination of investigations, and confidential closure practices. The more matters are resolved outside formal public hearings, the more important it becomes for the Commission to receive anonymized summaries explaining what happened and why.

Otherwise, the public sees activity but not accountability. And the Commission receives workload information without the substantive information necessary to identify systemic problems, regulatory gaps, or areas requiring legislative reform.

The Ombudsman Report should not merely count activity. It should help the Commission understand recurring issues in Nevada common-interest communities and whether the existing regulatory system is addressing them.

I respectfully ask the Commission to direct the Division to improve future Ombudsman Reports by adding anonymized enforcement and closure summaries sufficient to inform Commission oversight and public understanding, while preserving legitimate confidentiality under NRS 116.757.

Respectfully submitted.



Michael Kosor
Nevada HOA Reform Coalition
NVHOAReform.com