YAMPA VALLEY HOUSING AUTHORITY BOARD MEETING

June 11, 2026

Kathi Meyer, Yampa Valley Housing Authority Board President, called the regular meeting of the Yampa Valley Housing Authority to order at 12:00 p.m.

Board members participating included: Catherine Carson, Lou Tortora, Steve Muntean, Shannon Doin-Landers, Mark Halvorson, Angelica Salinas, Cole Hewitt, Scott Yeates, Daniel Buri, Michael Ann LaMotte, Kathi Meyer and John Spezia.

Others present included: Elliot Lawrence, Acting Executive Director; Sandy Jacobs, Finance Director; Mandy Alles, Accountant; Alyssa Cartmill, Real Estate Manager, Emily Katzman, Development Project Manager; Elizabeth Hinchman, Grants and Development Coordinator; Sarah Newman, Administrative Assistant; Bob Schneider; Alison Brodie; and Dave Barnes, City Alternate. Sarah Katherman prepared the minutes.

EN RE: PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

EN RE: BOARD MEMBER COMMENT

Catherine encouraged board members to attend the Pride Month activities this weekend. She thanked City Council for their thoughtful discussion on the Housing Needs Assessment.

Lou stated that the board priorities exercise had been tallied. The top two priorities are governance, which is covered in the Charney/Keyes proposal, and building community trust/mill levy renewal strategy. He proposed utilizing the Communications Team and a few others to develop a plan for community outreach toward building community trust.

Steve asked if the board feels that it is urgent to fill the two open positions now, or whether it would be preferable to wait until the regular scheduled process at year-end. There was a discussion of the pros and cons, with a consensus to wait.

Angelica reported that the South Routt Housing Authority is up and running with a nine-member board. She stated that activities thus far have been limited to organizational/administrative matters.

Kathi stated that the full Charney/Keyes proposal would be distributed to the board tomorrow. She said that the proposal is for the training to occur over two consecutive full days in August, with a follow-up day at a later

date. An upfront deposit of $11,000 would be required. Kathi confirmed that a full written report/plan would be provided. There was a discussion of scheduling. Kathi said she would discuss options with Charney/Keyes.

EN RE: CONSENT AGENDA

The following items were presented on the consent agenda:

a. Review and approval of the May 14 & 20, 2026 meeting minutes

b. Review and approval of April 2026 balance write-offs (none)

c. Review and approval of April 2026 check register

d. Review and approval April 2026 financial statements

MOTION

Lou moved to approve the consent agenda, items a – d, as amended. Catherine seconded. **The motion carried unanimously.**

EN RE: STAFF COMMENTS

Elliot reviewed the operational updates, as provided in the meeting materials. He reported that 28 units at the Cottonwoods have closed and that another 12 are expected to close by the end of June. He said that 27 units (31%) remain unallocated, but that the Real Estate Team continues to receive applications. He said that the Real Estate Team would discuss a strategy for how to handle unallocated units. He presented several scenarios that could be considered. He confirmed that a proposal would be presented to the board prior to any action being taken. In response to a question from Dave regarding carrying costs, Elliot said that carrying costs would kick in at six months following the issuance of the C.O. Kathi said that sales of 75% of the units would cover the debt costs, and that they are close to that now. Michael Ann said that the demand at the 130% - 140% of AMI level has not materialized, and that it is not a matter of marketing. Catherine noted the high demand at the 100% - 120% of AMI level and offered that YVHA needs to find a way to lower the AMI on the remaining units. There was consensus that the focus needs to remain on the local workforce rather than modifying the deed restriction to open up eligibility. All agreed that the financial implications for YVHA of all possible options, including lowering the AMI, need to be known in order to make a decision.

EN RE: LONG-TERM YVHA REVENUE DISCUSSION

Cole noted that the Finance Team is currently made up of Kathi and himself, as well as Sandy, Emily, and Elliot. He suggested that more board participation on the committee would be helpful as they work through the long-term funding issue. He presented a hybrid proposal developed by the Finance Committee for YVHA to reduce

its mill levy ask from 1 mill to 0.5 mill and to combine that with a request for a set amount of the STR tax revenues to be granted to YVHA annually. He noted that the commitment by the City of STR funds would be limited by TABOR to annual appropriations. He said that this revenue stream would allow for bonding, particularly if the sunset on the mill levy were extended beyond 10 years. He added that the target is to put the mill levy renewal measure on the 2027 ballot to allow the language to state, "without raising taxes…"

Catherine said that the discussion should be driven by a determination of how much annual funding is needed by YVHA to fulfill its mission. She said that it would be important to have a well-articulated plan for what the community will get for its money. There was a discussion of the development pipeline, with an acknowledgement that the Slate Creek Neighborhood has an unknown timeline, and that the USFS project remains conceptual at this point. Steve offered that he did not think reducing the mill levy was necessarily a good PR move and offered that asking for a longer sunset could also backfire. He questioned the current staffing levels of YVHA, given the lack of upcoming projects, adding that the role of YVHA in the development of Slate Creek is unknown. Cole said that YVHA would be very involved in the development of Slate Creek, and noted that the role of YVHA is that of ownership. Mark stated his support for asking for the full 1 mill, and suggested that the Cottonwoods would be a good selling point. Angelica said that the most recent study indicates that there remains a catch-up need, not just a keep-up need, for housing in the community and that YVHA has a lot of work ahead. Scott offered that YVHA knows what it is doing and why it needs to be done, but does not have an answer regarding how. Several board members expressed support for asking the voters to renew the full 1 mill.

EN RE: HILLSIDE VILLAGE REHABILITATION PROJECT

Emily and Elliot presented the plan for the rehabilitation of Hillside Village Apartments (HSV). The details of the existing conditions of the buildings and the plan for the renovations are provided in the meeting materials, which also include photos of the site and documentation of the need for a comprehensive update. Emily noted that the top priority is to maintain the 36 units that are subject to USDA Section 515 vouchers (rental assistance). She reviewed how this program works. Elliot said that the full scope of the project is still in the works and would be defined by the budget. He said that certain requirements must be met per CHFA. He added that they are trying to plan the project such that it will not trigger new requirements, such as fire suppression sprinklers.

Emily reviewed the proposal to apply for 4% LIHTC and state housing tax credits to fund the project. She reviewed the proposed ownership structure which would include a 99.9% limited partner (tax credit investor) with YVHA as the sole member of the General Partnership. She offered that this was a proven model for rehabilitating older housing projects. The tax credit application is due in August, with notice of allocation in November.

Emily reviewed the proposal to relocate residents during the construction. She noted that three households currently residing at HSV exceed the 60% of AMI threshold. She said that YVHA would work with these families to secure alternative permanent housing. She said that while the threshold is currently 80% of AMI, that threshold would be reduced to 60% following the rehabilitation. Emily said that rents would have to be increased, but that due to the rental assistance voucher program the increase would affect approximately 19 households. YVHA would provide assistance for 2 – 3 years to cover the marginal increase and allow an extended time for these families to prepare for the increase.

Catherine noted the importance of HSV, which serves the very low-income segment of the community. She said that it would be important to analyze how many residents would be cost burdened by the rent increase and suggested it might be appropriate to reduce the calculation to below 30%. She said that she would like to see an estimate of the total cost. Elliot said that work is still being done on the pro forma. He and Emily reviewed the next steps in the process. Elliot said the cost of the LIHTC application would be approximately $50,000. He said that the whole project is anticipated to cost approximately $18MM with an estimated $10MM to come from the LIHTC program.

Shannon asked about the rents that the tenants would pay during the relocation. Elliot confirmed that their rents would remain the same and that it would be a requirement that the temporary units would be comparable to the current units. John asked about facilities provided in each unit such as laundry. Elliot said that common laundry stations would continue to be used, as installing individual appliances would not be feasible within the space constraints of the existing units. The units will be equipped with air cooling, per CHFA requirements.

Mark expressed concern with the cost estimate of relocation, which he suggested would be longer than currently estimated. He added that the focus should be on needs, and that designing to a budget was a mistake. He also expressed support for installing a fire alarm system and perhaps sprinklers, even if they are not required.

Lou said that YVHA needs to evaluate the risk profile of the proposed ownership structure. Scott reviewed the risk associated with being the guarantor of the permanent debt with tax credit equity. He said that this has the potential to destroy YVHA. He noted that as the guarantor, YVHA would also be on the hook for overruns. He offered that the YVHA board needs to decide if it is appropriate for the organization to guarantee projects or not. Mark agreed and highlighted the worst-case scenario. He suggested that YVHA should pursue a development partner. Several board members agreed that an alternative to taking on the guarantee risk was needed. Emily offered that more information was needed to make an informed decision, but noted that there are real trade-offs to be considered and that the board needs to understand the options.

Following further discussion, the board directed staff to continue with the design and cost estimating processes, and to research alternatives to mitigate the risk profile of the project. Options will be discussed by the Development Team and brought back to the board in July.

EN RE: USFS HILLTOP PROJECT

This item was tabled to the next board meeting.

EN RE: SLATE CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD UPDATE

Lou stated that in the interest of time he would not review the constraints analysis. Any questions regarding it should be sent to him. He said that feedback is needed regarded the number of units to focus on for the initial phase. He said that the existing water system can accommodate around 400 units.

Mark said that he would not support any plan that did not include a master plan for the infrastructure needed to develop the full site. Steve offered that the community needs a small "proof of concept" development before it will support any master planning. He agreed, however, the sizing of the infrastructure would need to be based on the full site. Catherine offered that a pilot project of 200-250 units would be acceptable if the focus is on serving those with the greatest need. Lou said that a 250-unit project could be proposed with infrastructure planning for the future. He said that it would be important to define "market rate" if a proposal is considered that includes this terminology. He suggested that "market rate" might be defined as no second homes. Scott said that mixing in market rate homes could help to finance the rest of the units. Mark offered that a project of 250 units should not need to include market rate homes. There was agreement that an initial development of 250 units should all be affordable.

EN RE: ADJOURNMENT

The regular meeting of the YVHA Board of Directors was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

No further business coming before the Board, same adjourned sine die.

Kathi Meyer, President

Sarah Katherman, Minute Taker