

**COMMISSION FOR COMMON-INTEREST COMMUNITIES AND CONDOMINIUM HOTELS  
MEETING MINUTES DECEMBER 6, 2022**

**VIA IN PERSON AND WEBEX VIRTUAL MEETING  
DECEMBER 6, 2022**

Nevada State Business Center  
3300 W. Sahara Avenue  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Nevada Room  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89102

The meeting was called to order at 9:02 A.M.

**1-A) Introduction of Commissioners in attendance**

Michael Burke, Phyllis Tomasso, Charles Niggemeyer, June Heydarian, James Bruner and Kim Lighthart.

Commission Counsel: Chief Deputy Attorney General Rosalie Bordelove

**1-B) Swearing In of New Commissioners**

Commission Chair Michael Burke swore in new commissioners, June Heydarian and Kim Lighthart.

**1-C) Introduction of Division staff in attendance**

Sharath Chandra, Administrator; Charvez Foger, Deputy Administrator; Jason Wyatt, Ombudsman; Shareece Bates, Administration Section Manager; Terry Wheaton, Chief Compliance Audit Investigator; Gary Little, Program Training Officer; Kelly Valadez, Commission Coordinator; Maria Gallo, Commission Coordinator. Michelle Briggs, Chief Deputy Attorney General; Virginia Tomova, Deputy Attorney General.

**2) Public Comment**

Adam Clarkson, owner of the Clarkson Law Group and chair of the Community Associations Institute-Legislative Action Committee commented. Mr. Clarkson provided a copy of the position statement previously submitted to the Commission for the September workshop. Mr. Clarkson gave his support for the final draft of the proposed regulation and encouraged ongoing cooperation with the Division and Commission on drafting the Health Safety Welfare regulations.

**3) Adoption Hearing for LCB FILE No. R129-21**

Sharath Chandra reminded the Commission of the steps taken to get to this point of adoption. Mr. Chandra reminded the Commission of the first public workshop held March 1, 2022, where public comment was gathered, and a second draft of regulation created. Mr. Chandra stated that the amended draft was presented at the second public workshop on September 13, 2022, where public comment was again used to present the final draft for adoption.

Commissioner Niggemeyer stated his approval with the final draft of the proposed regulation.

Commissioner Bruner stated the Commission spent enough time reviewing the regulation and he stated his approval for the final proposed regulation.

Commissioner Burke moved to adopt the proposed regulation known as LCB File No. R129-21. Seconded by Commissioner Niggemeyer. All approved. Motion carried.

#### **4-C) NRED v. Sierra Ranchos Property Owners Association, for possible action**

**Case No. 2018-1663**

**Type of Respondents: Board Members**

##### Parties Present

Michelle Briggs, Chief Deputy Attorney General was present representing the Division.  
William Roth, Sierra Ranchos POA, Secretary was present.

##### Preliminary Matters

Ms. Briggs stated she did talk to Equus Management and received their management agreement, budget, and Mr. Roth did provide bids that were required to be submitted before this meeting. Ms. Briggs stated she did have questions about the documents that were provided and questions about their election and if their board vacancies were filled.

Chairman Burke asked Mr. Roth to give an update of what has transpired since the last meeting.

Mr. Roth stated they needed to have two valid proposals from licensed Nevada civil engineers to review the proposed work needed to correct the Washoe County violations. They received two formal proposals one from Nortech and the second from Lumos & Associates. The Lumos proposal did not come in until the 14<sup>th</sup> or 15<sup>th</sup> of November. They had a member meeting on the 12<sup>th</sup> of November and already had in hand a proposal from Nortech, so in order to get that going they signed the proposal with Nortech and they started working. Mr. Roth stated another issue is that a reserve study update needs to be completed because there was not one completed in 2021. Mr. Roth stated he sent out a private letter at his own expense to the residents regarding the board vacancies. The management company Equus also sent out letters to the residents asking for board nominations. Mr. Roth stated a lot of the owners of these properties are investment owners, some are disinterested, and some owners are scared (of the Commission).

Chairman Burke asked if the October 5<sup>th</sup> inspection by Summit Engineering occurred.

Mr. Roth stated Summit Engineering did a site visit and Joy Marvin was present. Mr. Roth stated he was not present at the site visit but did provide them maps and other documents. Ms. Marvin has communicated with Summit, but they have not submitted a proposal.

Chairman Burke asked Mr. Roth about his relationship with Ms. Marvin.

Mr. Roth stated he has a good relationship with Ms. Marvin and the management company Equus Management.

Commissioner Bruner stated he would like to hear a little bit more about the reserves.

Mr. Roth stated right now they have a large sum of money that should have been spent last year and even more money is supposed to be transferred in anticipation of the work to be done. Mr. Roth stated there is supposed to be a special assessment to further fund the reserve amount needed for the work to be done. Mr. Roth stated the monthly normal assessment is going up, from \$245 to \$380 a year. Mr. Roth stated they need a reserve study update so they can figure out what amount they need to be targeting in the future.

Chairman Burke stated some of the items have been accomplished and some were not, but it was not from a lack of desire not to get it done and asked where they go from here.

Ms. Briggs stated the scope of work in the proposal the board approved is very large and they will burn thru a lot of money.

Mr. Roth stated the amount of work that needs to be completed is very complex and involves several steps by different companies.

Ms. Briggs stated the engineer is going to put together a list of things that need to be done and the board will have to bid those items out for the Washoe County violations. Ms. Briggs stated the problem that she has with the association since 2012 is that the assessment amount of \$380 is for the year and that is not near enough.

Chairman Burke asked if the residents of the community who own property were really going to complain over paying an assessment of \$380 a year?

Mr. Roth stated most of the properties were investment property and the residents that are complaining about the amount are the ones who have lived in the valley for a long time.

Commissioner Bruner stated the association has a funding issue, the board needs to get tough and get the special assessment, because the funding is going nowhere currently.

Ms. Briggs stated she did not see in the budget a reserve to repair the roads. Ms. Briggs stated this needs to be a significant amount because they are underfunded. The reserve study that was conducted in 2020 stated that they were less than 20% funded.

Mr. Roth stated there is a special assessment in the new budget and there is a budget rejection meeting on December 15th.

Ms. Briggs asked how much the special assessment was and what was that amount based off. Ms. Briggs stated she would like to see the board figure out from Nortech what needs to be done and come back with that list and bids to complete the work. Ms. Briggs stated they need to correct the issues with the county and make the roads useable.

Chairman Burke moved the board needs to come back to the next meeting with the Nortech itemized proposal with bids for the work to be done. All bids must be submitted to Ms. Briggs, and the Board meet and confer by phone before the next meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Niggemeyer. Motion carried.

**5-A) NRED v Rancho San Juan Homeowners Association, Christopher Seckler, Sebastian Mayo, and Cesar Valdez, for possible action**

**Case No. 2021-161**

**Type of Respondent: Board Members**

Parties Present

Virginia Tomova, Deputy Attorney General was present for the Division.

Christopher Seckler was present.

Preliminary Matters

Chairman Burke stated they are there for Mr. Seckler's petition for reconsideration of commission fine and possible payment plan.

Mr. Seckler stated he would like a payment plan.

Chairman Burke asked if Mr. Seckler could pay \$100 a month.

Mr. Seckler stated he could pay \$50 a month.

Ms. Tomova stated the Division is agreeable to the \$50 a month payment plan until the amount owed is paid off.

Chairman Burke asked the other Commissioners if there was any questions or problems with the proposed payment plan.

Chairman Burke moved to amend the order that the \$7491.95 be allowed to be paid monthly to the Division in the amount of \$50 a month beginning January 15, 2023. Seconded by Commissioner Niggemeyer. Motion passed.

**4-B) NRED v Rancho San Juan Homeowners Association, Christopher Seckler, Sebastian Mayo, and Cesar Valdez, for possible action**

**Case No. 2021-161**

**Type of Respondent: Board Members**

Parties Present

Virginia Tomova, Deputy Attorney General was present for the Division.

Patrick Orme, Esq. was present representing Rancho San Juan HOA.

Preliminary Matters

Mr. Orme stated they have a functioning board and they have approved a new budget for 2023. The monthly assessments are going from \$110 to \$226 a month. During the October board meeting the board put on the agenda that if any of the homeowners had any questions about the change in the assessment amount that the meeting was going to be conducted via ZOOM. The residents showed up at a board member's house. Mr. Orme stated at the November budget meeting that was properly noticed, no homeowners appeared. Mr. Orme stated that by the end of 2024 the Association will be at 65% of the reserve amount. The Association would like to get a bare bones reserve study done with some of the items cut out so after the two years they might have a larger percentage of the reserve amount saved.

Chairman Burke asked about the issue with the pool.

Mr. Orme stated the pool would either be filled in and no more pool, or completely renovated, currently it is shut down, closed, and locked.

Ms. Tomova stated the pool closure is until they catch up their reserve account because they have been severely mismanaged for many years. The Division is working with Mr. Orme to get the Association up to speed in terms of their budgeting. Ms. Tomova stated once they can budget for their utilities and regular maintenance then the Association can look into more recreational activities like opening the pool. Ms. Tomova asked that Mr. Orme provide a copy of the new reserve study once completed.

Mr. Orme stated hopefully a new reserve study can be provided in a month or two. The board is waiting to sign the proposal for the new reserve study. Mr. Orme stated some of the homeowners are in the lien stage, but nobody has been foreclosed on, and since they have started the lien process some of the other homeowners have

come in to pay their assessments.

Chairman Burke stated progress has been made and asked where they go from here. Chairman Burke stated there should be another status update.

Ms. Tomova stated a continuance should be made until the next meeting so the Association can have another reserve study done and give updates in terms of funding to the Division.

Chairman Burke stated he would like to see how many residents are paying the new assessment amount from Mr. Orme at the next meeting.

Commissioner Bruner asked if any meetings were going to be held in person or were they going to continue to be held via ZOOM.

Mr. Orme stated because threats were made to the Community Manager at the last in person meeting, he recommended that the Association no longer hold in person meetings.

Chairman Burke moved that they continue this case until the next meeting and that the Association provide the Division with and update on the amount collected on the new \$226 assessment and how much is the Association spending putting liens on the properties. Seconded by Commissioner Niggemeyer. Motion passed.

**4-A) NRED v. Monterey Grand Manor Owners Association, Dale Milligan, Susan Moore, Richard Jagodzinski, and Saturday Aisuan, for possible action.**

**Case No. 2021-1049**

**Type of Respondent: Board Members**

Parties Present

Virginia Tomova, Deputy Attorney General was present representing the Division.

I-Che Lai, Esq. was present representing Monterey Grand Manor OA.

Preliminary Matters

Ms. Tomova stated Mr. I-Che has reached out to her office and expressed an interest that his client would like to resolve this matter. Ms. Tomova stated they are not quite ready to reach a settlement in this matter. There are still outstanding issues: a CPA audit and continue to employ a Community Manager. Ms. Tomova stated per the reserve study the community is only 6% funded and the Association needs to work on getting the reserve amount up. Ms. Tomova stated the board members need to contact the Office of the Ombudsman to discuss what education classes they will need to take to understand their responsibilities. Ms. Tomova stated if the Association continues to show improvement in those areas and they continue to supply information to the Division they could work towards a settlement. Ms. Tomova stated this case should be continued until the next meeting to see what progress the Association has made.

Mr. I-Che stated the Association does have a reserve study and they do have a Community Manager and they are in line for getting the audits completed for 2021 and 2022. Mr. I-Che stated they would like to have the case continued and want to continue to voluntarily work with the Division. Mr. I-Che stated the issue with the underfunding the reserve account is being addressed, they have raised the assessment amount to boost the reserve account. Mr. I-Che stated by the next meeting they should have a better understanding of the funding issue.

Chairman Burke moved that they continue this case until the next meeting, with the understanding that the

parties are working towards a settlement and that the Association will cooperate and provide the Division with the information they are requesting ahead of the next commission meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Niggemeyer. Motion carried.

**4-E) NRED v Wine Ridge Estates Homeowners' Association, Fernando Hernandez, Rebecca Coins for possible action**

**Case No. 2021-942**

**Type of Respondent: Board Members**

Parties Present:

Virginia Tomova, Deputy Attorney General, was present representing the Division.  
Ryan Hastings, Esq. was present representing Wine Ridge Estates HOA.

Preliminary Matters:

Ms. Tomova stated the Association has reached out to the Division for a continuance and was asked by the Division to appear before the Commissioners as to why a continuance is requested.

Mr. Hastings stated a continuance is being requested because his office had just been retained on December 5, 2022, and his office is in the process of gathering documents and information that will help them provide whatever information the Division is requesting. Mr. Hastings stated they will cooperate and ensure any documentation is provided. Mr. Hastings stated by the next meeting they hope to have some sort of resolution if not provide a substantive response before any disciplinary action.

Ms. Tomova stated the Division does not have an objection for the request for a continuance to allow for counsel to provide the necessary documents to the Division before the next meeting.

Chairman Burke moved to continue this matter to the next meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Bruner. Motion carried.

**6-B) Ombudsman's Summary Report**

Jason Wyatt presented this report that was provided to the Commission in the meeting packet.

**6-C) CIC Compliance Caseload Report and Summary**

Terry Wheaton presented this report that was provided to the Commission in the meeting packet.

**6-D) Education and Information Officer Report**

Antonio Brown presented this report that was provided to the Commission in the meeting packet.

**6-E) Licensee and Board Member Discipline Report**

Shareece Bates presented this report that was provided to the Commission in the meeting packet.

**6-A) Administrator's Report**

Sharath Chandra reported that there are 3 updates. The Division has started the technology project for the Licensing and HOA sections, where there is a portal for the Associations to register and submit all their documentation. Currently it is all paper based. Mr. Chandra stated the Division's budget goes thru the legislative process. The Ombudsman's Office is self-funded, and they have a good reserve. Mr. Chandra stated the Division does not anticipate any changes going forward. Mr. Chandra stated the Division is still working on getting a licensing section in Carson City for minimal licensing transactions. Staffing issues are plaguing the State and the Division. Mr. Chandra stated the Division is currently not sponsoring any bills before this legislative session.

**7-A) Discussion regard Commissioner's speaking engagement request**

Commissioner Niggemeyer stated he is traveling to Reno to help teach a class in January, but he did not have a specific date.

**7-B Discussion regarding the State of Nevada Controller's Office debt collection process for fines issued by the Commission**

Commissioner Niggemeyer stated there was no update at this time.

**7-C) Discussion and decision to approve minutes of the September 13-14, 2022, Commission meeting**

Chairman Burke moved to approve the September 13-14, 2022, meeting minutes. Seconded by Commissioner Tomasso. Motion passed.

**8) Discussion and Decision on date, time, place, and agenda times for upcoming meeting(s) including setting the meeting calendar for 2023**

- March 7-9, 2023
- June 13-15, 2023
- September 26-28, 2023
- December 12-14, 2023

**4-G) NRED v Dayton Valley Community Association, Dennis Drury, Carla Cole, Sandy Mass, Joan Latimer, Steve Gallisdorfer, James Kepler, Michelle Carr for possible action**

**Case No. 2021-761 and 2021-696**

**Type of Respondent: Board Members**

**Parties Present:**

Virginia Tomova, Deputy Attorney General was present representing the Division.

Gayle Kern, Esq. was present virtually representing Dayton Valley Community Association. Dennis Drury, Carla Cole, Sandy Mass and James Kepler was present virtually. Steve Gallisdorfer and Michelle Carr present via phone.

**Preliminary Matters:**

Chairman Burke stated there was a Motion to Dismiss, Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss and an Answer to the Complaint that were all filed.

Ms. Kern stated out an abundance of caution because the Administrative Code or the Statute is not very clear on how they were to be handled they filed the Answer to the Complaint because they did not know if the Motion to Dismiss would be heard.

Chairman Burke asked if the Association's position is that the Motion to Dismiss should be heard first and then if not resolved thru the Motion proceed to the hearing.

Ms. Kern stated that was her understanding of how things should proceed, because from her knowledge the Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure do not apply because this case is not a District Court proceeding.

Ms. Tomova stated Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure will apply if there is no mention in the Statutes on how to handle certain procedural issues. Ms. Tomova stated the Motion to Dismiss should be denied and proceed on to the hearing.

Ms. Kern stated the Commission can hear the Motion to Dismiss and determine if they want to deny it, Ms.

Kern stated they are ready to proceed with the case.

Chairman Burke stated he wanted to hear from the Commissioners about hearing the argument for the Motion to Dismiss so that things are taken in procedural order.

Commissioner Niggemeyer stated he was fine with hearing the argument for the Motion to Dismiss.

Chairman Burke stated Ms. Kern could proceed with her arguments for the Motion to Dismiss.

Motion to Dismiss Arguments

Ms. Kern gave her argument.

Ms. Tomova gave her argument.

Ms. Kern gave a brief response.

Ms. Tomova gave a brief response.

Chairman Burke gave brief instructions to the Commissioners about the Motion to Dismiss.

Chairman Burke moved to deny the Motion to Dismiss. Seconded by Commissioner Bruner. Motion carried.

Opening Statements

Ms. Tomova gave her opening statement.

Ms. Kern gave her opening statement.

Chairman Burke stated the parties need to stipulate to what documents are going to be admitted.

Chairman Burke stated this case will be continued until December 7, 2022, at 9:00 A.M.

**9) Public Comment**

No public comment.

**10) Adjournment**

Meeting recessed at 4:12 P.M. on December 6, 2022.

Minutes prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_

Maria Gallo  
Commission Coordinator



**COMMISSION FOR COMMON-INTEREST COMMUNITIES AND CONDOMINIUM HOTELS  
MEETING MINUTES DECEMBER 7, 2022**

**VIA IN PERSON AND WEBEX VIRTUAL MEETING  
DECEMBER 7, 2022**

Nevada State Business Center  
3300 W. Sahara Avenue  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Nevada Room  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89102

The meeting was called to order at 9:03 A.M.

**2) Public Comment**

No public comment.

**4 - G) NRED v. Dayton Valley Community Association, Dennis Drury, Carla Cole, Sandy Mass, Joan Latimer, Steve Gallisdorfer, James Kepler, Michelle Carr for possible action**

**Case No. 2021-761 and 2021-696**

**Type of Respondent: Board Members**

**Parties Present**

Virginia Tomova, Deputy Attorney General was present representing the Division.  
Gayle Kern, Esq. was present virtually representing Dayton Valley Community Association.

Chairman Burke asked if the parties have stipulated to what documents will be admitted as evidence.

Ms. Tomova listed the documents she was not stipulating to.

Ms. Kern listed the documents she was not stipulating to.

Chairman Burke moved to admit the following documents into the record:

CICC: 14-16, 75-85, 201-204, 193-196, 197-200, 206-208, 153-158, 1-10, 117-120, 214-215, 50-52, 113-115, 146-150, 143-145, 128-131, 284-286, 125-127, and 77.

DVCA: 730-738, 1-51, 52-130, 549-599, 600-613, 640-642, 706-716, and 542-548.

**State's Witness**

Christy Staffen testified.

Ms. Kern cross-examined Ms. Staffen.

Joseph Hughes testified.

Ms. Kern cross-examined Mr. Hughes.

Lisa Miller-Hobbs testified.

Ms. Kern had no questions for Ms. Miller-Hobbs.

Respondent's Witness

Dennis Drury testified.

Ms. Tomova cross-examined Mr. Drury.

James Kepler testified.

Ms. Tomova cross-examined Mr. Kepler.

Closing Statements

Ms. Tomova gave her closing statement.

Ms. Kern gave her closing statement.

Commissioner Niggemeyer stated there was a perception when the Intervention Affidavit was filed, that someone was getting profit indirectly from the service that was required to be done by the Association. Commissioner Niggemeyer stated he did not see how there was any indirect compensation to Mr. Kepler.

Commissioner Bruner stated there was a benefit, however indirect because Mr. Kepler has ownership thru various companies in the golf course, and he does receive an indirect benefit from the Association with improvements and maintenance of Palmer Road and Palmer Gate.

Commissioner Tomasso stated everyone benefits in a golf course community and her own community does subsidize the golf course. Commissioner Tomasso stated the community should have been aware of this case because board members cannot remove other board members only the community can. Commissioner Tomasso stated she feels that they cannot take action on this case.

Commissioner Heydarian stated there was a perception, that there could be actions taken by the board that may deviate from what is in the best interest of the Association. Commissioner Heydarian stated by not vetting the candidates' statement properly, the community may have had the opportunity to question Mr. Kepler and he could have responded to their concerns. Commissioner Heydarian stated her concern was whether Mr. Kepler was able to fairly govern the Association should there ever be a question or issue before the board regarding Palmer Road and Palmer Gate. Commissioner Heydarian also questioned whether the board of directors could also be fair in those matters.

Commissioner Lighthart stated even though there was a small ownership interest in Tour Specs by Mr. Kepler, there was an obligation by the Association to maintain Palmer Road and Palmer Gate. Commissioner Lighthart stated there has not been a gain or personal profit to Mr. Kepler. Commissioner Lighthart stated the board could not comply with the Division's directive because board members cannot remove another board member.

Chairman Burke stated this matter was not a clear violation. Mr. Kepler has not benefitted personally from the Association maintaining Palmer Road and Palmer Gate. Mr. Kepler disclosed on his candidacy form, that he was an owner of the golf course and that he wanted to work with and have a relationship with the association as an owner of the golf course. Chairman Burke stated the Division order that the board must remove Mr. Kepler is wrong, only the Association can remove a board member.

Chairman Burke made a motion that the Division has not met its burden and that they find for no discipline for the Respondents. Commissioner Niggemeyer seconds the motion. Motion carried 5:1 with Commissioner Bruner opposed. Motion carried.

**9) Public Comment**

No public comment

**10) Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 4:58 P.M on December 7, 2022.

Minutes prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_

Maria Gallo  
Commissioner Coordinator

To Be Approved By Commission