YAMPA VALLEY HOUSING AUTHORITY BOARD MEETING

June 25, 2026

Kathi Meyer, Yampa Valley Housing Authority Board President, called the special meeting of the Yampa Valley Housing Authority to order at 1:00 p.m.

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

Others present included: Elliot Lawrence, Acting Executive Director; Emily Katzman, Grants & Project Manager; Elizabeth Hinchman, Grants Coordinator; Mandy Alles, Accountant; Sarah Newman, Administrative Assistant; George Eck, YVHA attorney; Ryan Spaustat, Landmark Consulting; Jia Carrol; Bob Schneider; and Julia Coccaro, *Steamboat Pilot & Today.* Sarah Katherman prepared the minutes.

EN RE: PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

EN RE: BOARD MEMBER COMMENT

There was no board comment.

EN RE: SLATE CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD ANNEXATION PETITION DISCUSSION

Elliot reviewed the work accomplished by the Slate Creek Steering Committee (SCSC). He reported that towards the end of the recent two-day work session there was a discussion of the possibility of accelerating the schedule and petitioning the City to place a ballot measure for the annexation of a small portion of the Brown Ranch property on the 2026 November election ballot (Option 2) rather than waiting until November of 2027, as laid out in the roadmap to annexation that the SCSC had developed (Option 1). Angelica said that Dave Barnes had proposed Option 2 and the group had agreed to consider it and discuss it with their respective boards/councils. She said that Dave had suggested that there was likely to be little opposition to a very small annexation. She noted that the SCSC having cooperatively developed and agreed upon a roadmap to annexation is itself an accomplishment. She acknowledged that Option 2 would entail a tight timeline. George clarified that the deadlines for various steps in the annexation and ballot measure processes precludes the ability for SCSC members to consult with their respective boards and reconvene to make a decision. He reviewed the steps in the process. He said that City staff has indicated that if YVHA were to submit an annexation petition by June 30, 2026, the Substantial Compliance Hearing would be scheduled for July 7, 2026, with the Eligibility Hearing to be scheduled for August 11, 2026. If

Council determines that the property does meet the requirements, Council could pass an ordinance annexing the property. City Council would consider this on August 18, 2026 and August 25, 2026. George explained that the proposal would go through the zoning process concurrently, and an Annexation Agreement would need to be approved by both the YVHA Board and City Council for the annexation to be approved. YVHA would be required to submit a draft Annexation Agreement with the land use applications on June 30. George suggested that the YVHA Board would need to decide immediately if it is interested in pursuing the accelerated timeline.

Emily presented the detailed roadmap to annexation (Option 1) that defines the six simultaneous workstreams that would occur over the next year and a half with the annexation going to the voters on the November 2027 ballot. Extensive community outreach and scenario planning would be done, with defined milestones along the way. She noted that under the agreed upon scenario, YVHA would be taking the lead as the project manager. She stated that this would be resource-intensive for YVHA staff. She said that the SCSC would remain active through the process, providing oversight on the project. Emily said that under the accelerated Option 2, many of the workstream functions would occur after a parcel of land is annexed. She reviewed the timeline of events that would have to occur if Option 2 is chosen. She said that the required Annexation Agreement would be very general, with the details to be worked out afterward, and added that less time would be available for community engagement.

George said that the Annexation Agreement would be conditioned upon the details being worked out after the fact. He said that the zoning would be Traditional Neighborhood Design, which is an overarching district. The specific zone districts that would establish what uses would be allowed where would be reviewed and approved at a later date. He noted that the agreement would be written such that no construction could occur until these details were defined. He confirmed that the future zoning would be established via ordinance and would also be subject to referendum by the voters.

Emily reviewed the pros and cons of Option 2, as outlined in the meeting materials. She presented a site plan and indicated two possible parcel sizes that could be considered for annexation under the accelerated option: one of approximately 26 acres and one of approximately 46 acres. Both of these parcel sizes conform to the constraints analysis of what the City can absorb without significant investment or infrastructure upgrades.

Ryan Spaustat, of Landmark Consulting, stated that the 26-acre parcel could be considered a bridge to a larger project. He offered that this small parcel could be presented as a pathway for YVHA to continue doing what it has been doing. Ryan stated that one of the merits of pursuing an accelerated path to annexation is that it would be a challenge to get a development partner to commit to a project prior to annexation, particularly given the history of failed annexations of this land. He said that approximately 150 units could be accommodated on the 26-acre

parcel, but that it would not be large enough to also accommodate commercial or mixes uses. Lou noted that the 46-acre parcel corresponds closely to the Neighborhood A area of the Brown Ranch plan.

In response to a question from Mark, Ryan explained that the 26-acre parcel was chosen as an option because this area would be accessed through The Glen without the need for a direct connection to US 40. There was discussion of whether the City would require the direct connection to US 40, even with the 26-acre parcel.

Angelica offered that the list of pros and cons are accurate and should be carefully considered. She said that if a smaller annexation is pursued there needs to be very clear guardrails to ensure continuing affordability for all the units that would be built. She added that the community is frustrated with the lack of progress and said that if Option 1 is chosen, YVHA must be able to articulate why.

Emily reported that City staff has stated that improvements to the water system are needed before any homes could be delivered in this area, and that those improvements are not scheduled to be completed before 2029. Ryan confirmed that the water improvements are planned and are in the City budget.

Lou stated that his biggest concern with Option 2 is the lack of community engagement. He said that he is not confident that any annexation would be approved without robust engagement. He agreed that if a smaller annexation is proposed, there must be guarantees of affordability. He also expressed concern with the impact of a small annexation on potential future annexations.

John discussed the history of failed annexations on this site. He expressed concern with the tight timeline, and emphasized the importance of organizing a communications and outreach campaign as soon as possible.

Kathi suggested that the main argument in favor of Option 2 is that it would accelerate the delivery of homes, but this is not true if no units can be delivered until 2029 due to the required improvements to the water treatment plant. She also noted that YVHA had committed to fully engaging the community with a new plan. She offered that the timeline is too short. Shannon agreed. She emphasized the importance of full community engagement. She also expressed concern that a small annexation might preclude future annexations.

Mark stated his opposition to Option 2. He said that there is no plan for development, no idea of what it will cost, when it would start, or who would be the development partner. He said that the community will ask these questions and YVHA will not have the answers under the accelerated timeline.

Michael Ann agreed. She offered that a decision to pursue annexation in 2026 would be a political decision based on the timing of mill levy renewal, the voter turnout in an even year election, etc. She said that YVHA would be assuming 100% of the political risk if the measure fails and the benefits of Option 2 are not worth that risk.

Dan agreed. He said that although he understands the urgency, the political risk was too high for marginal benefit. He said that the argument for delivering units sooner is not accurate, and the timeline would not allow for good messaging.

Catherine offered that the community is losing hope, and many people are choosing to leave. She said that although this urgency is real, YVHA had committed to extensive community engagement and that going to City Council without that is a risk. She asked if it would be worth the risk if 200 – 250 units on the 46-acre parcel could be built with high level measures on affordability. Catherine noted that to attain affordability without the economies of scale of the larger project, a higher per unit subsidy will be required, and that amount is unknown. She also asked if staff had the capacity to craft an annexation agreement with adequate protections within the time constraint. She also questioned whether this is what the community wants, and without robust engagement, that remains unknown. Catherine expressed concern that so much work would be deferred until after the annexation vote.

Regarding the "proof of concept" argument, Angelica noted that without the economies of scale, particularly with respect to infrastructure, a smaller project may prove to be more difficult than a larger one and may require much higher subsidies. She noted that the comments from YVHA board members indicate that they want more community engagement to ensure that the community understands the proposal and is firmly behind it. Catherine stated that if the decision is to pursue Option 2, polling will be necessary. She added that any recommendation could not be considered final until YVHA hears from City Council. Catherine stated that if the decision is to go with Option 1, YVHA needs to pursue a new project in the interim.

Cole asked if the roadmap for Option 1 considers a master plan of the whole site, even if a smaller portion is annexed initially. Emily said that there was not clear direction from SCSC regarding a master plan for the whole property. Cole stated that while he understands the urgency, he feels that there must be a master plan for the site, and then a plan for annexation of a portion of the land. He stated there should also be a good cost estimate and identified funding sources as well, prior to the election.

John stressed the importance of developing a robust communication and engagement plan. He stated his support for Option 1. There was discussion of community engagement and the DST process. Lou offered that the voters and not only the stakeholders must be engaged. He stated he could not support Option 2.

Kathi asked if any board members were in favor of Option 2. No one responded. There was consensus on the board not to take action to submit an annexation application next Tuesday.

Angelica clarified that the reasons that the YVHA board is opting not to pursue annexation in November 2026 are that the board would like to see more in-depth community engagement and a master plan of the site that

would support a smaller annexation. In addition, the board is in support of Option 1, the detailed roadmap agreed upon by the SCSC. Dan added that there is no quantitative evidence that pursuing annexation in 2026 would accelerate the availability of units on the property.

Catherine noted that the board will need to consider the implications of having the mill levy renewal and the annexation on the same ballot in 2027.

EN RE: ADJOURNMENT

The special 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