

**From:** [Paul De La Cruz](#)  
**To:** [NRED Administration](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: Jan 14 contract item  
**Date:** Thursday, January 22, 2026 10:08:42 PM  
**Attachments:** [Outlook-w0htpdfx.png](#)  
[01\\_14\\_26\\_agenda\\_FINAL \(4\).pdf](#)

---

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

**I am requesting that the following statement and topic be added to the agenda for the March CIC Task Force meeting: “Structural Conflicts Affecting Property Manager Autonomy and Compliance with NRS 116.”**

In my experience as a homeowner and former board member, it appears that many community managers are placed in a difficult position. They are required to comply with:

- NRS 116 and related statutes,
- the association’s governing documents,
- federal and state laws,
- and the fiduciary obligations owed to the association,

yet they are simultaneously employed by management companies that may direct or influence their actions. These companies are not licensed by NRED, are not directly regulated under NRS 116, and are not subject to the same accountability mechanisms as individual community managers.

This creates a structural conflict where managers may lack the autonomy needed to perform their duties honestly and independently, especially when the interests of the management company diverge from the requirements of NRS 116 or the association’s governing documents.

I believe this issue deserves discussion at the Task Force level, as it affects:

- transparency,
- statutory compliance,
- homeowner trust,
- and the ability of managers to fulfill their legal obligations without undue pressure.

If the Task Force is willing to explore this topic, I would be happy to provide examples, documentation, or homeowner perspectives to support the discussion.