

FILED

MAY 19 2026

NEVADA COMMISSION FOR
COMMON INTEREST COMMUNITIES
AND CONDOMINIUM HOTELS



From: [Darren Cobb](#)
To: [Maria Gallo](#); [NRED Administration](#)
Subject: Public Comment Submission – Proposed Regulatory Amendments
Date: Tuesday, May 19, 2026 10:46:57 AM
Attachments: [Workshop Comments.docx](#)

WARNING - This email originated from outside the State of Nevada. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

To the Nevada Real Estate Division / Commission Staff,

Please accept the attached public comment letter for inclusion in the record regarding the proposed regulatory amendments currently under consideration by the Nevada Commission for Common-Interest Communities and Condominium Hotels.

As a Nevada homeowner and long-time common-interest community stakeholder, I felt it important to provide written comments addressing several of the proposed changes, particularly those relating to investigative authority, confidentiality, procedural accessibility for homeowners, and overall regulatory transparency.

While I recognize and support the Division's important oversight and enforcement responsibilities, I believe it is equally important that the regulatory framework maintain an appropriate balance between effective enforcement, due process, and public accountability—particularly where common-interest community governance and homeowner rights are directly impacted.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and for ensuring public participation remains part of this important rulemaking process.

Please confirm receipt of this submission and inclusion in the official public comment record.

Respectfully,

Darren Cobb
10869 Bramante Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada 89141
cobb572@gmail.com

Darren Cobb
10869 Bramante Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada 89141

Nevada Commission for Common-Interest Communities
and Condominium Hotels
c/o Nevada Real Estate Division

RE: Public Comment Regarding Proposed Regulatory Amendments / Nevada Real Estate
Division Investigative and Remedial Authority

Commissioners:

I respectfully submit these comments as a Nevada homeowner, long-time common-interest community leader, and stakeholder with extensive practical experience in association governance, homeowner relations, and the application of Nevada's common-interest community regulatory framework.

At the outset, I want to be clear that I support meaningful regulatory oversight, legitimate enforcement activity, and the Division's responsibility to investigate violations where appropriate. Effective oversight is essential to maintaining integrity, accountability, and homeowner confidence in the common-interest community governance system.

My concern is not with enforcement itself.

Rather, my concern is whether certain proposed regulatory amendments may unintentionally expand administrative authority in a manner that diminishes transparency, reduces accountability, and further distances homeowners from a regulatory process that already feels procedurally inaccessible to many of the individuals it is intended to protect.

Complaint Process Accessibility

For many homeowners, the act of filing a formal complaint is itself a significant undertaking.

The current process often requires complainants to identify specific statutory or regulatory violations, organize documentary evidence, complete formal affidavits, obtain notarization, separate allegations into distinct filings, and navigate procedural requirements that may be difficult for individuals without legal training or representation.

While procedural structure is necessary, the cumulative burden can create the perception that homeowners are being discouraged from pursuing legitimate concerns rather than being provided a fair and accessible pathway for regulatory review.

A regulatory complaint process should promote confidence, accessibility, and fairness—not exhaustion.

Concerns Regarding Confidential Investigative Remediation

My primary concern relates to the proposed expansion of the Division's authority to implement or negotiate remedial action during confidential investigative proceedings.

Confidentiality serves an important and legitimate purpose in preserving investigative integrity, protecting sensitive information, and encouraging candid participation.

However, confidentiality should not be expanded in a manner that permits substantive governance-related matters to be resolved entirely outside meaningful public accountability.

This concern is particularly significant where the subject of the investigation is a homeowners' association.

Unlike purely private disputes, homeowners associations exercise statutory authority, adopt and enforce governing policies, expend homeowner assessment funds, and make decisions directly affecting the rights, obligations, and financial interests of their members.

If an association becomes the subject of regulatory investigation and the matter is resolved through confidential remedial action rather than public Commission adjudication, homeowners may have no ability to determine:

- The nature of the allegations raised;
- Whether statutory or regulatory deficiencies were identified;
- Whether corrective action was required;
- Whether association funds were expended in connection with the matter;
- Whether governance practices, policies, or enforcement procedures were modified; or
- The basis upon which the matter was resolved without public review.

That creates a legitimate transparency concern.

Even where confidentiality is legally appropriate during an active investigation, some degree of accountability should remain where public-facing governance entities are involved.

Existing Confidentiality Concerns

I am also concerned that the Division's current interpretation and application of confidentiality protections under NRS 116.757 already limit visibility into enforcement outcomes in ways that many homeowners find difficult to understand.

Expanding the Division's informal remedial authority without simultaneously addressing transparency safeguards may further erode public confidence in the fairness and openness of the regulatory process.

The issue is not whether the Division should have tools to resolve matters efficiently.

The issue is whether efficiency should come at the expense of transparency, homeowner awareness, and meaningful oversight.

Additional Areas Warranting Careful Review

I also encourage the Commission to carefully revisit other proposed amendments affecting:

- Formal petitions for regulatory change;
- Record transfer obligations during community manager transitions; and
- Reserve study and reserve funding requirements.

Regulatory rulemaking often receives far less homeowner participation than legislative proposals, despite the fact that the practical effect on governance can be equally significant.

Industry professionals, management companies, association counsel, and institutional stakeholders routinely participate in these discussions. Homeowners should not be left behind in decisions that directly affect their communities and legal rights.

Closing

I respectfully urge the Commission to carefully consider whether the proposed amendments strike the proper balance between enforcement efficiency, due process, transparency, and homeowner accountability.

Nevada homeowners deserve a regulatory framework that is both effective and trustworthy.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Darren Cobb
Las Vegas, Nevada