

**COMMISSION FOR COMMON-INTEREST COMMUNITIES TASK FORCE
MEETING MINUTES DECEMBER 19, 2025**

**VIA TEAMS VIRTUAL MEETING
FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2025
11:00 A.M.**

1-A) Call to Order; Introduction of Task Force Members in attendance

Dr. Kristopher Sanchez, Director of the Department of Business and Industry; Donna Zanetti, attorney with Leach Kern Gruchow Song; Michael Buckley, attorney with Fennemore Law; Jason Hoorn, supervising community manager with Taylor Association Management; Douglas Flowers, attorney with Holland and Hart; David Varon, homeowner; Mark Leon, homeowner; Phil W. Su, Senior Deputy Attorney General, Nevada Attorney General's Office; Christal Park Keegan, Senior Deputy Attorney, Real Estate Division; Sonya Meriweather, Ombudsman, Real Estate Division; Sharath Chandra, Administrator, Real Estate Division.

Each of the Task Force Members in attendance gave a brief introduction.

1-B) Review of the meeting's goals and objectives

Dr. Kristopher Sanchez stated that one of his goals as Director is focusing on modernizing agency processes, looking internally and externally to determine best practices. Dr. Sanchez stated that the Task Force is an extension of that effort to learn from industry experts and from the general public, utilizing that feedback to identify gaps and areas of improvement. Dr. Sanchez stated that Nevada's regulator framework is quite strong and other states look to Nevada for guidance and experience. Dr. Sanchez encouraged the Task Force members to have open, respectful dialogue through the process; he encouraged members to speak freely. Dr. Sanchez stated this initial meeting is to get a foundational level of understanding from the Administrator and Ombudsman, on the issues they see as regulators. Dr. Sanchez also stated that other industry experts will appear before the Task Force in future meetings and he encouraged the members to add agenda items for discussion as well.

Michael Buckley, stated that he applauds the idea of modernizing processes. Mr. Buckley stated that along with Ombudsman Meriweather, they spoke with experts at Rand on several topics. Mr. Buckley stated that one example that could be helpful is updating disclosure forms. Mr. Buckley also stated, that after reading some of the public comment, he believes there are already regulations in place to allow the Real Estate Division (the "Division") and/or the Commission for Common-Interest Communities and Condominium Hotels (the "Commission") to answer some of the questions posed. Mr. Buckley stated that perhaps some further clarity may be needed to help the public best understand the relationship between the two bodies, and to understand how they work together and the responsibilities of each. Mr. Buckley also stated that he would like to see a future agenda item address the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mediation and arbitration procedures.

2) Public Comment

Amanda Flocchini, Chief of Staff for Director Sanchez, stated that written public comment had been received from Paul De La Cruz, Mike Kosor, Laura Chapman and Jeannie King.

William Lovegren read a statement expressing his concern with the perceived limitations placed on homeowners who rely on the Real Estate Division. Mr. Lovegren stated that Nevada has approximately 642,411 HOA homeowners, whose assessments help fund the Division's operations. Mr. Lovegren stated that despite the substantial financial contribution by homeowners, the Division has established significant barriers to assisting homeowners when it comes to filing complaints against their homeowner associations. Mr. Lovegren stated that the current system leaves homeowners with little recourse, while management companies and associations operate with minimal accountability. Mr. Lovegren stated that homeowners deserve an agency with enforceable complaint powers, timely investigations and the Division's ability to impose meaningful corrective action when violations of law occur. Mr. Lovegren also stated that the Division's HOA oversight function should be dissolved and the authority granted back to the court system, to avoid administrative barriers. Mr. Lovegren stated that the current system and funding oversight, does not provide homeowners with practical protections or effective enforcement.

Michael Kosor congratulated Dr. Sanchez on reinstating the Task Force and he wishes the group success in achieving its goals. Mr. Kosor stated he had already submitted public comment for each item on the agenda. Mr. Kosor stated his agreement with Mr. Buckley, that the ADR program needs to be a focus of the Task Force. Mr. Kosor stated that based on the meeting agenda, he did not see the distinction between the Task Force and the Commission. Mr. Kosor stated that there are already statutes and regulations afforded to the Commission and he would like to see the Task Force tackle bigger topics and items that require legislative reform.

Solomon (Will) Bradley stated that he currently runs a website from a concerned citizen perspective, with interesting information regarding HOA scandals. Mr. Bradley stated that his association is currently under investigation by HUD and the Equal Rights Commission, for religious discrimination. Mr. Bradley stated that the fiduciary duty of board members, who make terrible decisions, may cause themselves investigations, which may cost homeowners tens of thousands of dollars in legal fees. Mr. Bradley stated that he is a registered lobbyist and works as an unpaid volunteer assistant to Senator Carrie Buck. Mr. Bradley stated that better governance and enforcement of HOAs is necessary for the industry. Mr. Bradley stated that Nevada's HOAs are in crisis, and he hoped that the Task Force would find best practices to make the system work best for all homeowners.

3) Agency Presentation

Sharath Chandra reviewed a two-page slide presentation and overview of the Division. Mr. Chandra stated that one of the Division's primary functions is licensing of real estate agents, builders, developers, timeshares, appraisers and energy auditors. Mr. Chandra stated that there are more than 41,000 licensees throughout the state regulated under five chapters of law. Mr. Chandra stated the Division also has a real estate education section, responsible for training and education and compliance section, responsible for enforcement. Mr. Chandra stated there is a 5-member Real Estate Commission as well as a 5-member Commission of Appraisers of Real Estate. Mr. Chandra reviewed the snapshot in relation to the Ombudsman's Office and reported that the HOA industry continues to grow each year. Mr. Chandra stated that the Division also licenses the community

managers who work for management companies along with the homeowner associations. Mr. Chandra pointed out that the Commission represents different parts of the HOA community and industry and all members are appointed by the Governor. Mr. Chandra stated the role of the Commission is to oversee disciplinary action and provide regulation.

Sonya Meriweather gave a brief history of the Ombudsman's Office, stating it was established by the legislature in 1997 with the passage of SB 314. Ms. Meriweather stated that the office was created with the mission of helping homeowners and board members better understand their rights and responsibilities of living in a common-interest community. Ms. Meriweather stated that the office facilitates the ADR program, and administers the intervention affidavit complaint process, when homeowners allege there are violations of law and/or governing documents. Ms. Meriweather explained that the office also has a registration section, that is responsible for collecting information from all associations across the state, and an education and training section, who are responsible for providing education and training to homeowners and board members. Ms. Meriweather explained that the office conducts in person and online training classes, has developed brochures, cheat sheets, form templates, newsletters and FAQs to provide information. Ms. Meriweather stated that the office receives complaints in many forms including in writing, in person, by email, by telephone and sometimes as referrals from other governmental agencies. Mr. Meriweather explained that Division staff gather information and evaluate the best way to resolve a complaint. Ms. Meriweather explained the different types of forms that may be filed depending upon who the complaint is against. Ms. Meriweather reviewed the Ombudsman's Assistance Report and read statistics on the daily activities of the office as of October 2025.

4) Discussion and Possible Action Items

Dr. Sanchez explained that the purpose of items listed on the agenda as action items is to have discussion, and if there are areas the Task Force members would like to see action, those items will be called out for future agenda items. Dr. Sanchez stated that at the conclusion of the Task Force meetings, staff will produce a report that will be presented to the Governor's Office, with recommendations of legislative changes.

Mr. Chandra while referencing the agenda topics in the section, reiterated that one of the goals of the Ombudsman's Office is to engage the large percentage of homeowners who are not actively involved with their association. Mr. Chandra stated that many of the issues homeowners bring to the office are practical matters that are sometimes in statute but not purely aligned with the language. Mr. Chandra expressed hope that the Division's active participation along with the recommendations of the Task Force, will assist the Ombudsman's Office with guidance and direction in order to better serve homeowners.

A-1: NRS 116.3115(9) regarding capital improvements and proper notice

Mr. Chandra noted that from a homeowner's perspective, receiving notice of certain actions within the association is of primary importance. Mr. Chandra stated that it is very important for homeowners to understand when and how the process of capital improvements is performed. Mr. Chandra stated that there is some opportunity in improving the language and providing a clearer definition of capital improvement. Mr. Chandra suggested the discussion could focus on how homeowners are notified of these decisions and whether there should be a protocol for associations to follow to ensure proper notification and use of designated funds.

Ms. Meriweather reported that the office gets calls from homeowners questioning whether certain projects within their community are capital improvements or upgrades to existing amenities. Ms. Meriweather stated this frequent topic was important to add to the Task Force agenda to ensure the office is helping homeowners understand the distinction.

Christal Park Keegan noted that NRS 116 doesn't define capital improvement, nor does it define structure and without guidance there are potential for issues. Ms. Keegan pointed out that the office has seen associations use surplus funds or construction defect funds be used without the 21-day notice to homeowners, because owner funds are not being used.

Mr. Buckley stated that it appears that both the Commission and Division have statutory power to issue a regulation to define capital improvement. Mr. Buckley referenced NRS 116.623, which affords the Division by regulation, the disposition of petitions for declaratory orders and advisory opinions where applicable. Mr. Buckley agreed with Mr. Chandra's request to review the language but stated his belief that the Division and/or Commission, has the authority to adopt regulation.

Jason Hoorn expressed his thoughts as a practitioner, stating that the issue is when to define a capital improvement. Mr. Hoorn stated that many practitioners have no issue with the noticing requirements, but it would be most helpful to have a working definition that is reasonable and defines when a project becomes a capital improvement.

Donna Zanetti agreed that there is a need for a definition of capital improvement. Ms. Zanetti stated that when advising her clients, she generally defines capital improvements as new, additional major components of common elements. Ms. Zanetti stated this is helpful to distinguish between components of reserves, which are treated differently. Ms. Zanetti stated it is important to clarify capital improvements as new and additional items; this will benefit the associations with the notice requirements as well. Ms. Zanetti stated that from a practitioner standpoint, upgrading existing components should not be considered as capital improvements, even in instances where the costs may increase.

Mark Leon stated that a strict interpretation of an improvement that is not a capital improvement would be actions that preserve existing common elements in their current condition without materially enhancing value or extending useful life beyond the original design. Mr. Leon stated the referenced definition limits the application of good business judgment and common sense. Mr. Leon stated that board should have the flexibility to make use of advancements in technology and materials, and to extend the useful life of components when it makes practical economic sense without the burden of requiring a vote of the membership. Mr. Leon pointed out that the board members were already elected by the homeowners to make decisions and be practical stewards of association funds. Mr. Leon restated that non-capital improvements are maintenance level actions that preserve what already exists while capital improvements are transformative projects. Mr. Leon recommended the following definition: *Non-capital improvement maintenance expenditures mean any repair, replacement or enhancement of existing common area components undertaken by the executive board for the purpose of preserving, restoring or maintaining their intended function. Such expenditures may include the use of new technologies, materials or methods that improve efficiency, durability or sustainability of the component, provided that work does not materially alter the size, scope or intended use of the common element, nor constitute the addition of a new facility. These expenditures are considered part of the routine maintenance and are funded through the association's operating and/or reserve accounts rather than requiring special assessments.*

Douglas Flowers asked that there be some consideration within the language of the dollar amount expended for any improvement. Mr. Flowers stated that the language include a back stop for the dollar amount or percentage of the assessment being imposed, so that homeowners have the ability to weigh in on a such a decision that affects their finances.

In response to Mr. Flowers comments, Ms. Zanetti stated that it would be best not to stipulate to a specific dollar amount because the problem of inflation eroding the value of a flat dollar amount. Ms. Zanetti stated that a percentage of cost may be best for consideration of new language.

Mr. Hoorn expressed his agreement of the comments made by Mr. Leon and the distinction made between the two categories of improvements. Mr. Hoorn stated that if funds for any improvement are paid from the operating account or from an assessment, the reserves should not be considered.

Mr. Chandra appreciated the comments made by the Task Force members and stated that many times the complaints coming into the Division, center around the lack of notification to the homeowners. Mr. Chandra stated it is important that the association board members have the flexibility to make decisions, but when the complaint is filed, the Ombudsman's Office is often caught with trying to determine whether a project is or is not a capital improvement. Mr. Chandra stressed the importance that proper notification be provided, however the notice can also be a barrier and handicap the process. Summarizing the comments, Mr. Chandra believes it may be necessary to have statutory change that allows lawmakers to be engaged in this topic.

A-2: NRS 116.31087 regarding units' owners having certain complaints placed on the agenda

Mr. Chandra stated the agenda item was brought forward due to the number of questions coming into the Ombudsman's Office, indicating that there may be a lot of confusion between homeowners and the how the association's view the language. Mr. Chandra also pointed out that language in NRS 116.31085, should also be reviewed, when determining when and if a homeowner has the ability to add an item to an agenda of a board meeting. Mr. Chandra stated that the Division's goal is to provide homeowners with clarity on the process.

Ms. Keegan stated that NRS 116.31087 is poorly written, and therefore the Division is proposing combining sections 1 and 2 of the statute. Ms. Keegan pointed out that the change does not diminish the rights of a unit owner to request that a community issue or matter be placed on the agenda, which affords the homeowner notification within the ten-business days of the item on the agenda. Ms. Keegan pointed out that a review of the August 2020 Task Force meeting minutes, indicated that there was discussion of which issues may need to be addressed in executive session as opposed to open session items. Ms. Keegan referenced the language already written in NRS 116.30185, determines what subjects are discussed in executive session.

Ms. Meriweather reiterated that the consolidation of the two sections under the statue is the intent of what homeowners expect when they notify the association in writing, that they believe a violation of statute exists. Ms. Meriweather stated that the homeowner's often expect that they will be provided an opportunity to discuss an item requested to be on an agenda, however they are not afforded such opportunity and many times the board has determined that no discussion or dialogue is needed, thus causing conflict. Ms. Meriweather stated there is a perceived gap with the language of the law and the expectations of the homeowners.

Mr. Leon stated that the underlying purpose of NRS 116.31087 is puzzling and he would leave the language consolidation of the statute to the attorneys. Mr. Leon stated there is already a mechanism in place for homeowners to express concern with the conduct of the board, and that is during the homeowners open forum section of the meeting. Mr. Leon stated after reading public comments submitted for the Task Force meeting, his concern of the ability or lack thereof to compel the board to engage in open discussion regarding the alleged complaint and provide the member with a substantive response. Mr. Leon stated that a volunteer board member may find it foolish to openly discuss violations of law that may inadvertently jeopardize them personally or jeopardize the association's directors and officers insurance as well. Mr. Leon also pointed out that this provision of law can easily be misused to obstruct and distract the board from carrying out its normal business of making decisions on behalf of an association. Mr. Leon stated this issue is best left to be handled by the professionals, not board members.

Ms. Zanetti agreed with the comments made by Mr. Leon. Ms. Zanetti added that it is unrealistic to think that all homeowner allegations can have dialogue during the open session of the board meeting. Ms. Zanetti restated that homeowners may be best to address issues during the owner comment period and board members can provide written responses, which may be better and safer for the association. Ms. Zanetti stated the proposed language needs to moderate the expectations of homeowners going forward.

David Varon asked whether there could be some minimum evidence presented by homeowners before bringing up accusations. Mr. Varon stated that some may use this language to bring up new accusations each month, overwhelming a board in an attempt to get the board to commit to something they should not.

Ms. Keegan pointed out that the language in NRS 116.31087 states that written complaints are confined to alleged violations of the provision of the chapter or the governing documents.

Mr. Hoorn agreed with the comments made by Ms. Zanetti. Mr. Hoorn stated that many board members have no issue adding items to the agenda, however they are not always comfortable addressing the items in open session, opting to provide a response in writing. Mr. Hoorn stated the issue then becomes that the homeowner is not notified whether an action was or was not taken as a result of their complaint. Mr. Hoorn stated he would love to see some language requiring the board to provide a response.

Mr. Chandra reiterated that the goal is to allow some kind of mechanism for homeowners to put complaints on the agenda or at least prompt discussion by their board. Mr. Chandra agreed with Ms. Zanetti, that a written response or acknowledgement could be sufficient as follow up.

Ms. Zanetti stated that oftentimes when a board receives a letter alleging violations of NRS 116 and/or the governing documents, it is also a preliminary step to the filing of an intervention affidavit and the board's response may also be submitted along with the complaint. Ms. Zanetti stated that it is important to recognize the outcome of a change to this provision.

A-3: NRS 116.31031(1)(a)(b) regarding “reasonable” time to prohibit use of common elements and voting on matters related to the common-interest community

Mr. Chandra stated this particular issue comes up in concerns from homeowners to the Ombudsman’s Office. Mr. Chandra stated the importance of putting a timeframe on the prohibition. Mr. Chandra stated that the idea is not to confine reasonable time or restrict the association but there should be a specific amount of time when it comes to shared facilities and common elements within the community.

Ms. Keegan stated that the associations themselves are in the best position to define reasonable time to reflect their particular needs and expectations of their communities, this language is identified with the governing documents. Ms. Keegan stated that the Division can offer support by issuing non-binding guidance through advisory opinions to help communities apply this more consistently, but a rigid definition of reasonable would not be in the best interest. Ms. Keegan stated that similar to court, an association’s review of the severity of the violation, safety risk, property damage and/or harassment, along with history of violations are important factors for an association to consider.

Mr. Buckley stated that he believes the Commission could create a regulation to address this issue. Mr. Buckley stated that the statute is very broad and states for any violation of the governing documents, which goes beyond use of a common area. Mr. Buckley stated that after reviewing the uniform law, he was surprised to see that an association cannot prohibit a homeowner from voting.

Ms. Meriweather also addressed that some sanctions and prohibitions cited by the boards, not only extend for a period of time but also address potential subsequent occurrences. Ms. Meriweather stated that boards apply this provision differently and the language is broad, leaving it to the discretion of the board.

Mr. Leon stated there were two issues being discussed with this provision, what is a reasonable sanction and what is a reasonable time for a sanction to remain in effect. Mr. Leon pointed out that it is not uncommon for a homeowner to lose access to a common element, such as a pool or clubhouse, provided that the board’s actions are decided upon in advance and that proper notice is provided to the homeowner. Mr. Leon stated that community standards should be clearly identified such that immediate actions can be taken by a community manager or board if needed, to be later addressed during the appropriate time. Mr. Leon stated that some boards meet less than six times a year, and therefore a period of not more than 60 days to adjudicate seems reasonable. Mr. Leon stated that sanctions should not exceed 90 days in total and that infractions deemed as health and safety violations should be reserved for only the most egregious situations.

Ms. Zanetti pointed out that a lot of CC&Rs already address reasonable time and address the length of time a member’s privileges can be suspended. Ms. Zanetti stated the language often refers to the time as the violation remains uncured or for instance, as long as assessments are delinquent. Ms. Zanetti reminded the Task Force members that boards are run by volunteers, who meet only a few times a year, so consideration must be given to their authority to address statutorily.

Mr. Chandra summed up the Division’s purpose in this agenda item which was to get feedback on the issue of usage of common facilities. Mr. Chandra stated that it was important to remember that not all CC&Rs are alike, and many association documents were developed many years ago, so it’s important to consider the effects of the changes statewide.

A-4: Assessment of Procedural Gaps and Stakeholder Impact

Dr. Sanchez stated that all agencies across Business and Industry are completing an assessment of internal processes and the impact to stakeholders to ensure better service delivery. Dr. Sanchez asked for comments or recommendations from the Task Force members on their interactions with the Division.

Ms. Zanetti stated that she would like to see an adjustment to NAC 116.585(2). Ms. Zanetti stated it may be beneficial for the Commissioners to receive and have review documents submitted by associations prior to the hearing, as long as they were stipulated by both parties. Ms. Zanetti stated the Commissioner's ability to understand the materials being presented may make for a more efficient process.

Ms. Keegan thanked Ms. Zanetti for her comments and stated that this process is already in practice, occurring especially in cases with voluminous documents, such as audit cases that have thousands of pages of financial records. Ms. Keegan also expressed a word of caution in providing the Commission with documents in advance of a contested case. Ms. Keegan stated it would be important that the Commission avoid making any preconceived decisions with information received prior to a hearing.

Phil W. Su stated that he had had conversations with other attorneys within the Board and Commissions section of the Attorney General's Office. Mr. Su stated that for status checks, both parties tend to stipulate to the documents, which are then provided to the Commissioners. Mr. Su stated that the issue arises when there is a contested case however, if there were potential interpretation issues, the parties may not stipulate to those documents. Mr. Su stated that the Commission has a responsibility to rule on the evidentiary issues even if the parties stipulate to the facts. Mr. Su posited that perhaps the documents could be accepted by only one member of the Commission in advance, and then the determination would be made whether to make the documents available to the remaining Commission members.

A-5: Evaluation of Ombudsman Reporting Protocols and Potential Improvements

Dr. Sanchez asked for any recommendations from Task Force members.

A-5-a. Recommendations for Administrative Reform to Promote Fairness, Transparency, and Accountability

Ms. Zanetti stated she would like the Task Force to look at the ADR process. Ms. Zanetti stated that arbitration used to be the program default but at some point, it converted to mediation. Ms. Zanetti stated that any analysis of statistics on the outcomes of mediation, demonstrates that mediation is generally not resolving the majority of complaints. Ms. Zanetti reviewed the statistical reports provided by the Ombudsman's Office and stated that the arbitration process would likely yield a higher success rate. Ms. Zanetti stated that in order to improve the chances of successful proceedings going forward, it is important to increase the reimbursement for providers and pay them appropriately for their efforts.

Mr. Su pointed out that the rate tables for the AG's office agency costs increased from \$157.00 an hour to approximately \$250.00 an hour, and he wondered whether the Division could use those metrics in determining reimbursement.

Mr. Chandra restated that the Division's goal for the ADR program is ensuring that homeowners walk away from the process with some type of resolution. Mr. Chandra stated that the Division currently subsidizes a certain amount of mediations and consideration of a reasonable increase may be necessary.

B. For possible action: Discussion and decision to approve minutes of August 19, 2020, Task Force meeting.

Dr. Sanchez asked whether the minutes from the last meeting needed to be approved by the new members.

Ms. Keegan stated that for proper record keeping and pursuant to NRS 241.035, the meeting minutes needed to be approved.

Mr. Su confirmed that the current members are inheriting powers of the prior body and therefore it is appropriate for the minutes to be approved.

Dr. Sanchez motioned for approval of the minutes; seconded by Mr. Chandra. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Buckley asked the outcome of the previous recommendations made by the Task Force.

Mr. Chandra stated that the recommendations were included in the language for SB 72, which passed in 2021.

5) Recap of Decisions and Next Steps

Dr. Sanchez recalled that Mr. Chandra discussed a review of NRS 38 at the next meeting and asked for additional comments from the Task Force members.

Mr. Buckley stated he along with Ms. Meriweather, had spent a considerable amount of time with the Rand attorney and researcher, making recommendations to the state of Hawaii based on a number of laws. Mr. Buckley stated that another idea that may be worth discussing was having professional, paid board members run associations.

Ms. Zanetti asked that the Task Force review NRS 116.1107 regarding eminent domain. Ms. Zanetti recommended that there be amended language to allow the board of directors to convey common elements to the state or other entity that has eminent domain rights, without the necessity of that entity filing a lawsuit. Ms. Zanetti stated that there are numerous situations in the North where the Regional Transportation Commission needs a piece of common element and although everyone thinks it's a great idea, the board's hands are tied, and a lawsuit must be filed.

Mr. Buckley recounted a personal experience with easements within an association, recalling that the board can grant easements that may drastically change the usage of a common element without the vote of the members. Mr. Buckley stated the process needs a greater level of approval when fundamental changes are proposed.

6) For Possible Action: Discussion and decision on date, time, place and agenda items for upcoming meeting(s).

Dr. Sanchez recommended that the Task Force reconvene at the end of February, the date and time to be determined at a later date.

7) Public Comment

Solomon (Will) Bradley expressed his confidence in the goals of the Task Force and appreciated the members' efforts to refine processes for all who live in common-interest communities. Mr. Bradley recommended that the member look at the language within NRS 116, which affords homeowners the right to a public hearing when they are called to address alleged violations. Mr. Bradley stated from his experience that homeowners receive a more fair shake when the hearing is conducted publicly. Mr. Bradley stated that it would be helpful if the language regarding the appeal rights of homeowners was listed on the violation notice, so homeowners don't have to search through the statutes. Mr. Bradley also agreed with the potential option of allowing board members to be paid, stating people are more invested in the work as long as they are being paid. Mr. Bradley also encouraged the members to reform the language in NRS 116 to mandate that communities, especially condominium and high-rise communities, have earthquake insurance.

Mike Kosor stated that the Legislature created the Task Force with the ability to do more than the Commission. Mr. Kosor stated that although he appreciated the conversation during the meeting, it is his opinion that these discussions should have been handled by the Commission. Mr. Kosor recommended that an agenda item be added for the Task Force to review the Commission and determine why it is not fulfilling its intended purpose. Mr. Kosor also recommended that additional discussion regarding the use and abuse of reserve funding be addressed. Mr. Kosor also recommended that there be discussion on the business judgement rule, which was codified in Nevada law regarding HOAs, despite the American Law Institute citing that it is not appropriate. Mr. Kosor stated during that during the discussion in agenda item# 3, the Task Force is trying to address what he believed was an overexpanded use of the powers of the executive board. Mr. Kosor stated the bigger issue was inappropriate or inadequate notice to homeowners of an issue brought forward by another homeowner. Mr. Kosor ended by saying that there is currently no mechanism in place for homeowners to force the executive board to provide a homeowner with an answer after allegations are made and he believed the issue should be addressed at a future meeting.

6) For possible action: Adjournment

Dr. Sanchez adjourned the meeting at 1:03 p.m.