YAMPA VALLEY HOUSING AUTHORITY BOARD MEETING

July 2, 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; Emily Katzman, Grants & Project Manager; Alyssa Cartmill, Regional Property Manager; Araceli Googins, Housing Navigator; Elizabeth Hinchman, Grants Coordinator; Mandy Alles, Accountant; Laraine Martin, Communications; Sarah Newman, Administrative Assistant; and Tom Keyse. Sarah Katherman prepared the minutes.

EN RE: PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

EN RE: BOARD MEMBER COMMENT

Steve provided a list of the three City water supply projects that all must be completed before anyone could move into housing units in the Slate Creek Neighborhood. He stated the first building permits could not be pulled until the summer of 2029. If the most aggressive timeline is accomplished, the earliest that units could become available is likely to be 2030.

Tom Keyse of Charney/Keyse joined the meeting to discuss the schedule for the governance consulting session. Tom reviewed the proposal for the two-day workshop. He said that he would prepare in advance 25 – 30 policy templates related to process and means policies. These would be tailored specifically to YVHA and each would be discussed one by one. Together the policies form a system that works in concert with the mission and vision of the organization. He said that the minimum amount of time for the workshop is 12 – 13 hours, but that it is good to plan on 16 hours over two consecutive days. Following discussion, the board determined that September 11 & 12 would work best.

EN RE: CONSENT AGENDA

The following items were presented on the consent agenda:

a. Review and approval of the June 11, 2026 meeting minutes

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

c. Review and approval of May 2026 check register

d. Review and approval May 2026 financial statements

MOTION

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

Mark noted that the financial statements include $87,305 in expenses related to the Cottonwoods. He asked for an itemized list of all the Cottonwoods-related expenses. He noted this would be useful for ensuring that all the qualified expenses are properly reimbursed. Elliot said that a list had been sent to the Steamboat Partners last week. He said he would follow-up.

EN RE: STAFF COMMENTS

Elliot reviewed the operational updates, as provided in the meeting materials. Catherine requested that the board be copied on all press releases. She also suggested that the Communications Team should publicize the new housing navigation tool available on the website.

EN RE: ED SEARCH COMMITTEE UPDATE

Elliot stated that in response to the RFP, YVHA had received three proposals from executive recruitment firms. All firms were interviewed, and one was eliminated fairly quickly. The other two were carefully evaluated and compared. Elliot said that the Search Committee is recommending that YVHA engage Bridge Partners. Angelica explained the seven main reasons that the Search Committee is recommending Bridge Partners, as included in the meeting materials. She noted that the original price quote from Bridge Partners was $60,000, but that this had been reduced to $45,000, which is within the budget identified in advance. Steve explained that the price reduction would result in one senior partner leading the search rather than two. Catherine asked about the salary range and job description. Angelica said Bridge Partners will work with the YVHA board on both and confirmed that board approval would be required for both the salary range and the job description. Lou emphasized that the local cost of living must be discussed up front with all serious candidates.

MOTION

Mark moved to authorize the Search Committee to engage Bridge Partners at the negotiated fixed fee of $45,000 plus pre-approved out-of-pocket expenses, and to execute the engagement agreement so the search can begin. **The motion carried unanimously.**

EN RE: COTTONWOODS REAL ESTATE PRESENTATION

Michael Ann stated that the data from the Cottonwoods lottery and sales had been thoroughly analyzed, not just to inform the decision of how to address the unallocated units, but also to inform future projects and product decisions. She reviewed the demand study performed in 2023-24 by EPS, noting that the 100% - 140% of AMI households make up about 15% of total housing demand. The highest demand is in the under 80% of AMI category and the over 200% of AMI category, both of which are outside of the target ranges for the Cottonwoods.

La La reviewed the breadth of the marketing and outreach efforts that had been done. She discussed the strategy of starting the outreach with a process-heavy approach before pivoting to a product-based approach. She presented a chart showing the breakdown of how the 595 inquiries had learned about the project. She noted that of those inquiries, 404 were households under 100% of AMI. She then presented the data on the number of qualified applicants, lottery participants, and available units in each category. She also provided the details on households that purchased units above their income range. Michael Ann noted that the demand for 2 and 3-bedroom units was highest, and that the majority of buyers were one-person households, representing a wide variety of occupations.

Michael Ann presented a market comparison of the unclaimed 140% of AMI units at the Cottonwoods and comparable market rate units currently available for purchase. She noted that it is currently less expensive to rent than to buy. Steve noted that the Cottonwoods 3-bedroom units are a much better deal that the 2-bedroom units. Michael Ann discussed the AMI levels for 2026 compared to 2025 and noted that the increase will serve to lower the AMI category for many potential buyers, but that high interest rates continue to act as a disincentive to move.

Michael Ann stated that the balance on the construction loan is $8.1M. She introduced the list of possible actions that the board could take to sell the remaining inventory. She offered that simply continuing to market the units is unlikely to make much difference. She provided a breakdown of the price reductions (to bring the units into a lower AMI category) if YVHA were to use the remaining $386K STR funds granted by the City. Using these funds would redesignate 9 units from the 140% of AMI category to the 120% of AMI category. Another alternative would be to forgo the $311K in budgeted commissions and add that to the available STR funds, which would result in 12 units being redesignated from the 140% of AMI range to the 100% and 120% of AMI ranges. Either of these actions could be enacted by the board at this meeting. Michael Ann said that other actions to assist with the reallocation of units could include pursuing philanthropic donations or requesting additional STR funds, amending the deed restriction to include local employers or local remote workers, or utilizing YVHA funds (from the future development fee).

Lou suggested using the remaining the STR funds initially and then considering using the budgeted commissions to reallocate units to lower AMI categories. Scott, Angelica, Shannon, and Mark all stated their

support for using both the STR funds and the budgeted commissions. They stressed that this option is in line with the mission and vision of YVHA. In response to a question from Catherine, La La said that a new lottery would be held for the reallocated units, with all those who were unsuccessful in the previous lotteries being sent an invitation to join the new lottery automatically without a new application. She noted, however, that the circumstances for some households may have changed. Michael Ann suggested that following the reallocation, the board can discuss the other options for the 15 units that will remain.

MOTION

Angelica moved to approve the use of the remaining $386K in STR funds and the $311K in budgeted commissions to reallocate 12 outstanding units at the Cottonwoods from the 140% of AMI category to the 100% and 120% of AMI categories. Catherine seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.**

EN RE: RESOLUTION 2026-010 TO REDUCE COTTONWOODS PRICES

MOTION

Mark moved to approve Resolution 2026-010, a resolution to adopt the fifth supplemental 2026 budget appropriation to use development funds to buy down Cottonwoods unit prices in order to reallocate those units to 100% and 120% AMI categories. John seconded the motion.

Under discussion, Cole noted that for the first time YVHA is forgoing revenue, which is not great for the organization. He stated that he would be a hard “no” on forgoing the developer fee. He stated his support for the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

EN RE: HILLSIDE VILLAGE REHAB PROJECT PRESENTATION

Elliot noted that the Hillside Village Apartments (HSV) rehabilitation project had been discussed at a previous board meeting, but that many questions had remained, particularly regarding the scope of the project, the potential risk to YVHA, and the relative merits of YVHA acting as the developer, pursuing a fee developer, or pursuing a development partner, with YVHA serving as special limited partner.

Emily provided an overview of the history of HSV, its residents, its monthly rents, and that it qualifies for USDA Section 515 vouchers (rental assistance). She stated that HSV is in need of rehabilitation and reviewed the goals of the project.

Elliot stated that staff had done a walk-through with the architect, and that the replacement of the plumbing within the units had been added to the scope of work. He said that the first construction estimates would be

available next week. Elliot reported that Doug Shaffer (City Fire Suppression) and Todd Carr (Chief Building Official) had reviewed the project and had determined that the planned improvements would not trigger the need for fire suppression sprinklers. He added that they were pleased that a fire alarm system would be installed. Mark suggested that a cost estimate could be obtained for the sprinkler system, even if it is not required. Elliot said that the removal of the ceilings to add sound attenuation would not count towards the calculation that would trigger the sprinkler system requirement.

Emily reviewed the proposal to finance the project through the competitive federal 4% LIHTC program and the state tax credit program. She said that YVHA had been awarded a DOH grant of $1.2M to serve as gap funding, contingent upon the award of the 4% tax credits. Emily presented an overview of the three available financing structures: YVHA as developer, a fee developer, or a development partner. She presented the pros and cons for each option, as detailed in the meeting materials. She noted that using a fee developer would not relieve YVHA from being the full guarantor, but YVHA would retain significant control over the project and the property, and the risk to YVHA in comparison to YVHA acting as developer would be reduced. YVHA would cede the ownership as well as control over how the property is managed if a development partner is brought in, but the partner would assume all the risk, similar to the other LIHTC projects that YVHA has done. Emily presented a detailed summary of the risks, with potential costs and likelihood, if YVHA acts as the developer, along with the mitigating factors of those risks. She also presented a timeline of the risks.

Lou offered that in addition to the risks enumerated, there would also be unknown risks. He discussed the need for a contingency and for identifying the funding source to cover unknowns. John asked about asbestos. Elliot said that one unit in each of two of the buildings had been investigated and had been negative for asbestos. He said that tests on the remaining three buildings would be needed.

Scott stated that the construction completion risk should be calculated as the total cost estimate reduced by the land value – or approximately $14M rather than $12M.

Emily stated that staff needs clear direction regarding whether to proceed with the LIHTC application, which is due on August 3, 2026. There was a discussion of the importance of the cost estimate needed for the application and the work required to obtain an accurate estimate. Catherine stated that the board would need to schedule a special meeting to review the estimate prior to the application being submitted. Emily said that it would be possible to bring on a contractor familiar with these types of projects to consult on the estimates. There was a discussion of what would happen if the cost estimate submitted in the LIHTC application was inaccurate.

Lou stated that while he is not that concerned with the long-term risks, the unknown construction risks are an issue for him. He stated that a fee developer would only mitigate the execution risk. Scott offered that to

properly prepare the application it would take about six months following the initial construction estimates to refine the estimates and build on the work already accomplished. He noted, however, that the HSV buildings have come to the end of their useful lives and the option of demolishing them and rebuilding should be given careful consideration.

Regarding the likelihood of being awarded the 4% tax credits, Emily conceded that this round will be particularly competitive but noted that there are few rural projects in the running. She added that the state grant may not be awarded again if the LIHTC application is postponed until 2027.

Angelica said that the arguments against delaying the application by a year include that the buildings are in bad shape and the delay would affect the residents most, that the $1.2M in state grant funds might not be awarded next year, and that there are sunk costs of about $25K in the form of third-party reports, etc. that might need to be redone. She stated her support for waiting to submit the LIHTC application until 2027. Elliot suggested that if the rehab project is delayed, there may be an opportunity to really dig into one of the units that turns over to better inform cost estimates. John offered that although run-down, the conditions at HSV are not unlivable. Elliot confirmed that the electrical panels had been brought up to code and that that was the only identified risk to health or safety.

Cole stated that if the application is postponed, the YVHA board must make a decision sooner rather than later regarding its preferred financing and ownership structure for the project (YVHA as developer, fee developer, or development partner). Catherine reminded all that HSV provides housing for the lowest income segment of the population and that retaining the USDA rental assistance must be a priority. Mark stated that the cost of temporary housing will be very costly and should not be underestimated in evaluating the demolition option.

There was consensus on the YVHA board to postpone the application for 4% LIHTCs for the HSV rehab project until 2027.

EN RE: SLATE CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD UPDATE

Information to be provided in the weekly update to the board.

EN RE: HILLTOP PROJECT PRESENTATION

Information to be provided in a separate memo.

EN RE: ADJOURNMENT

The regular meeting of the YVHA Board of Directors was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

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

Kathi Meyer, President

Sarah Katherman, Minute Taker