

PROJECT SILO: THE LOCAL RECORD JUST GOT BIGGER

Silver Peaks · Lochbuie · Weld County · Brighton · Colorado 8th Congressional District

MEDIA CONTACT

Rachael Nike | Founder & Organizer | Data Center Accountability Project | Case 001: Project Silo | datacenteraccountability@pm.me

THE NEW DOCUMENT

On Sept. 30, the City of Brighton published an economic-development award announcement stating that the City provides Brighton EDC about \$800,000 annually, that the city manager may approve certain business incentives up to \$250,000, and that comprehensive-plan work expanded industrial land designations in Weld County by 80%. The City's Long Range Planning page, however, says the replacement Comprehensive Plan is still a draft and the 2016 plan remains in effect until a new plan is adopted. DCAP is requesting the records that reconcile those statements. [1][2]

Why this matters tonight

Tonight's CO-8 town hall is not a Project Silo hearing. It is a district-wide public forum. Project Silo is useful because it turns abstract questions about AI infrastructure, grid costs, water, local land use and public process into one concrete local case. 9NEWS says both CO-8 candidates declined invitations to the televised debate/town hall; the program instead features voters, advocates and industry leaders. [4]

DCAP position

Data centers can be good neighbors. Responsible development means the right project, at the right scale, in the right place, with the facts on the table before major commitments are made.

The local case in one paragraph

Denver7 reports an early-stage northeast Brighton proposal of roughly 2.5 million square feet across eight two-story data-center buildings near County Road 4 and 50th Avenue. Brighton controls the local land-use process for the site. Nearby Silver Peaks and Lochbuie residents are part of a separate municipality/county context and are asking how cross-jurisdiction impacts will be evaluated. 9NEWS reported that Lochbuie approved a five-year pause on applications for new or expanded data centers. [3][9]

BRIGHTON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: WHAT THE CITY SAID

City statement	What it establishes	What remains open
~\$800,000 annual City support to Brighton EDC	A substantial, disclosed City-EDC financial relationship.	The specific agreements, budget lines, performance measures and project-level role of that funding.
Mayor, city manager and City Council representation on the EDC board	Formal governance links between municipal leadership and the economic-development organization.	How conflicts, recusals, project confidentiality and incentive discussions are handled for individual projects.
City manager may approve certain business incentives up to \$250,000	Delegated incentive authority exists under the City's Business Attraction Incentive Policy.	Which recipients have received approvals, amounts, terms and whether any Project Silo-related entity has applied. No such connection is established by the Sept. 30 release.
Industrial land designations in Weld County expanded by 80%	The City publicly claimed an 80% expansion in its Sept. 30 release.	The acreage baseline, map, parcels, methodology and legal/adoption status. The City's planning page says the replacement Comprehensive Plan remains draft. [2]
Crusoe AI listed among employers attracted to Brighton	Brighton publicly identifies an economic-development relationship with Crusoe AI.	No evidence currently establishes that Crusoe is Project Silo's developer, operator, tenant, end user or incentive recipient. Do not infer that connection.

WHAT THIS NEW BRIGHTON RELEASE REQUIRES

The Sept. 30 release is useful because it converts broad development concerns into specific, answerable public-record questions. The goal is not to infer misconduct. The goal is to obtain the records behind the City's own claims.

The document request this creates

- All maps, acreage calculations, parcel lists and staff analyses supporting the 80% Weld County industrial-land statement.
- All ordinances, resolutions, adopted maps or other governmental actions that made any portion of that 80% change legally effective, if any.
- Current and prior versions of the Business Attraction Incentive Policy, plus approvals made under delegated city-manager authority.
- The EDCC award nomination/application and supporting materials submitted by Brighton or Brighton EDC.
- Records that identify whether Project Silo or its known parcel/applicant appears in discussions of the Weld County industrial expansion or incentive strategy.

Questions for Brighton on the record

- When the City says industrial land designations in Weld County expanded by 80%, is it describing an already-adopted change, a draft future-land-use map, or a projected change contingent on future adoption?
- What is the before-and-after acreage used to calculate 80%, and which parcels are included?
- Did City Council adopt any ordinance or resolution making that change effective? If so, identify it by number and date.
- Have any Project Silo-related entities sought or received City or EDC incentives, reimbursements, infrastructure commitments or other economic-development assistance?
- What role, if any, did Brighton EDC play in Project Silo site selection, recruitment, introductions or confidentiality arrangements?

Why this is a 9NEWS question

The City publicly celebrated its economic-development strategy one day before the CO-8 town hall and days before the Oct. 6 Council date. The timing proves nothing by itself, but the release supplies a contemporaneous public record that can be tested against planning documents, incentive records and Project Silo files.

INDUSTRIAL LAND + DATA CENTER SITING: THE QUESTION BEHIND THE 80%

WHAT THE RECORD SUPPORTS

Brighton says comprehensive-plan work expanded industrial land designations in Weld County by 80%, while its Long Range Planning page says the replacement plan is still draft. Weld County separately adopted a data-center ordinance in April 2026 that confines data centers in unincorporated Weld County to industrial zones and prohibits them in the agricultural zone. Those are separate jurisdictions, but together they make the acreage question important: if land is being redesignated from rural/agricultural categories to industrial, the public should know which parcels, why, and what high-intensity uses that change could enable. There is not yet evidence that Brighton's 80% change was adopted specifically for data centers. [1][2][11]

The zoning principle Brighton already uses

Brighton already uses distance rules for some legal businesses when land-use compatibility is a concern. Ordinance 2439 requires marijuana stores to remain at least 1,000 feet from schools, residential child-care centers, halfway houses, correctional facilities and substance-abuse rehabilitation centers. The ordinance reviewed does not list churches or places of worship. The comparison is about zoning tools, not about equating marijuana businesses with data centers. [10]

Why a data-center-specific code is a legitimate policy question

Brighton's own Land Use & Development Code says industrial uses may have impacts beyond the site and, depending on scale and intensity, may need special districts, more careful location criteria, and increased design or operational limits. Weld County has already written data-center-specific standards, including industrial-only siting, a public special-review path in I-1, a 65 dB(C) property-line noise limit, water documentation and a utility will-serve letter. [11][12][13]

Draft DCAP siting framework for discussion

- Create an explicit land-use definition for data centers, AI compute facilities, server farms and other high-load computing campuses.
- Use tiered review thresholds based on campus acreage, electrical load, backup-generation capacity and expansion potential.
- Require discretionary public review for large facilities instead of treating them as ordinary industrial buildings.
- Establish measurable buffers or compatibility standards for homes, schools, child-care centers, parks and other sensitive receptors, supported by acoustical, fire, air-quality and visual studies.
- Require full-build power and water demand, utility will-serve documentation, cooling method, wastewater plan and drought assumptions before major land-use approval.

DATA CENTER ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT | CASE 001: PROJECT SILO

- Require dBA and dBC/low-frequency noise analysis for continuous operation, generators and cooling equipment, with enforceable operating limits and monitoring.
- Require generator, battery/UPS, fuel, fire/HazMat and emergency-response plans before approval.
- Require cross-jurisdiction notice and consultation when nearby residents, roads, utilities or emergency services sit outside the approving city.
- Disclose applicant, developer, ultimate operator/end user when legally possible, plus public incentives, reimbursements and infrastructure commitments.
- Require financial assurance and decommissioning/stranded-infrastructure provisions for very large-load projects.

LANGUAGE DISCIPLINE

Do not say "Project Silo violates the marijuana setback law" or "Project Silo violates all sensitive-use rules." The marijuana ordinance applies to marijuana stores, not data centers, and exact Project Silo distances to every school or other sensitive receptor have not been established in the current DCAP record. The defensible point is that Brighton already uses siting buffers for some uses, while data-center-specific siting standards are the policy question now. [10]

WHAT IS VERIFIED / WHAT IS NOT

VERIFIED / REPORTED

Project Silo is an early-stage proposal reported at roughly 2.5 million square feet across eight two-story buildings. Brighton has an active development-review framework. Brighton's Sept. 30 release describes substantial City support for its EDC, incentive authority and an 80% Weld County industrial-land claim. H.R. 9340 passed the House 417-3 and failed to clear a 60-vote Senate procedural threshold on Sept. 30, 57-43. [1][3][5][6]

NOT ESTABLISHED

DCAP does not currently have evidence establishing Project Silo's final operator/end user, final electrical load, final water demand, final infrastructure cost allocation, a Project Silo incentive package, or a connection between Project Silo and Crusoe AI. The 80% industrial-land statement also requires underlying maps and adoption records before its legal effect can be described.

Seven accountability questions

- Who is it for?
- Who gets paid?
- Who pays?
- Who benefits?
- What risks were studied?
- Who carries the risk?
- Who is accountable?

Why the federal candidates belong in the conversation

Local zoning remains local. Federal policy can still affect interstate energy markets, utility standards, federal permitting, disclosure rules and infrastructure funding. Colorado considered two statewide data-center/large-load bills in 2026, SB26-102 and HB26-1030, and both were postponed indefinitely. Rep. Gabe Evans sponsored H.R. 9340, which addresses large-load grid-upgrade cost allocation. Rep. Manny Rutinel served on the Colorado House Energy & Environment Committee and voted yes on the motion to postpone HB26-1030 indefinitely. The useful questions are therefore concrete: who pays, what must be disclosed before major commitments are made, what enforceable federal protections should exist, and which siting decisions must remain local. [5][7][8][14][15][16]

RACHAEL NIKE: 4-MINUTE COMMENT

My name is Rachael Nike. I live in Lochbuie and organize the Data Center Accountability Project, an independent public-records and community-accountability effort examining Project Silo and large-scale data-center development in Colorado.

I want to be precise. We are not against technology, and we are not automatically against data centers. Data centers can be good neighbors when the size, scale, location, resource use and public costs fit the community.

Project Silo makes those questions real. Denver7 reports an early-stage proposal of roughly 2.5 million square feet across eight two-story buildings in northeast Brighton. Brighton makes the land-use decision, but a city boundary does not contain traffic, noise, utility infrastructure, emergency-response needs or other regional effects. Silver Peaks and Lochbuie are right next door.

Yesterday Brighton added another important piece to the record. The City said it provides Brighton EDC about \$800,000 a year, that the city manager can approve certain business incentives up to \$250,000, and that comprehensive-plan work expanded industrial land designations in Weld County by 80 percent. Yet Brighton's own planning page says the replacement Comprehensive Plan is still a draft and the 2016 plan remains in effect. We need the maps, acreage, parcels and authorizing records behind that 80 percent.

That matters because zoning determines what becomes possible. Weld County adopted data-center-specific rules this year. Data centers are limited to industrial zones in unincorporated Weld County, prohibited in the agricultural zone, and subject to additional review and operating standards.

Colorado also considered statewide data-center legislation this year. SB 26-102 proposed requirements for large-load data centers, including long-term utility contracts and electricity and water reporting. HB 26-1030 proposed a state data-center program tied to utility modernization and consumer and environmental protections. Both were postponed indefinitely.

So right now, projects are moving while major policy questions remain unresolved.

Brighton already uses buffers for some lawful businesses when compatibility matters. Its marijuana ordinance uses 1,000-foot separation from schools, residential child-care centers and several other protected uses. Data centers are different, but the land-use principle is the same: high-impact uses can require specific siting rules.

For data centers, we need public review thresholds, residential protections, full-build power and water disclosure, low-frequency noise standards, emergency planning, cross-jurisdiction consultation, and disclosure of incentives and infrastructure costs.

And that brings me to the candidates.

Congressman Evans, your Ratepayer Protection Act addresses who should pay for grid upgrades created by very large loads. What will you do next, and what protections do you support before a project is approved, not only after utility costs are incurred?

Mr. Rutinel, you served on the House Energy and Environment Committee and voted to postpone HB 26-1030 indefinitely. What did you believe needed to change, and what specific data-center policy would you support now?

And to both of you: what enforceable policies will you support so large data centers pay the incremental infrastructure costs they create, disclose projected power and water demand and public incentives before major commitments are made, and still leave local governments the authority to adopt siting, noise, safety, buffer and community-protection standards?

And when a project sits inside one city, but its impacts reach families across the municipal boundary, what should guarantee those neighboring residents a meaningful role before approvals are granted?

We can build the technology America needs. But the rules and the facts should arrive before the concrete.

KELLY HUSTON: 1-MINUTE COMMENT

My name is Kelly Huston. I live in Lochbuie, close to the proposed Project Silo site.

Brighton is the land-use decision maker for the site, but our neighborhood does not disappear at the city line. Families in Silver Peaks and nearby Weld County communities want the full project facts before decisions become difficult to reverse.

There is also a policy question now. Weld County adopted data-center-specific rules this year for unincorporated land, including industrial-only siting, special review in I-1 and a low-frequency noise limit. Brighton has publicly stated that comprehensive-plan work expands industrial land designations in Weld County, while its replacement Comprehensive Plan remains draft. Those records need to be reconciled.

We are asking Brighton for clear data-center standards of its own: power, water, noise, traffic, emergency planning, residential compatibility, infrastructure costs and a meaningful place for neighboring communities in the process before major approvals are made.

30-second reporter handoff

Project Silo is the local case study. Brighton's Sept. 30 economic-development release claims an 80% expansion of Weld County industrial land designations, while the City's planning page says the replacement Comprehensive Plan is still draft. Weld County, meanwhile, adopted data-center-specific zoning this year and prohibits data centers in its agricultural zone. We want the maps, acreage calculations and authorizing records behind Brighton's 80% statement, and we want a public discussion about data-center-specific siting standards before a project of this scale becomes the precedent.

ON THE RECORD: GABE EVANS + MANNY RUTINEL

Core question for both candidates

Colorado is attracting enormous data-center projects, but major statewide policy questions remain unresolved. Weld County has already adopted data-center-specific zoning and operating standards, while Brighton is considering Project Silo near communities in both Brighton and Lochbuie. If you represent Colorado's 8th District in Congress, what specific, enforceable policies will you support to ensure that large data centers pay the full incremental grid costs they create; disclose projected power and water demand and public incentives before major commitments are made; and do not prevent local governments from establishing their own siting, noise, safety, buffer and community-protection standards?

For Rep. Gabe Evans

Congressman Evans, your Ratepayer Protection Act addresses one part of this by requiring large-load customers to bear the incremental costs of grid upgrades. It passed the House 417-3, but the Senate procedural vote on Sept. 30 was 57-43, short of the 60 votes needed to advance. What is your next legislative step? And what protections do you support before a project is approved, not only after utility costs are incurred, including disclosure of projected load, public infrastructure commitments and incentives?

For Manny Rutinel

Mr. Rutinel, you served on the Colorado House Energy & Environment Committee and voted yes on the motion to postpone HB26-1030, Data Center & Utility Modernization, indefinitely. What did you believe needed to change in that proposal? What specific replacement policy would you support now on ratepayer protection, data-center incentives, power and water disclosure, and local control over siting?

Same follow-up for both

- Who should pay if a very large new load requires generation, transmission or distribution upgrades, and what financial assurances should be required before construction?
- What power, water, cooling method, backup-generation and public-incentive information should be disclosed before a local government makes major land-use or infrastructure commitments?
- When a project sits in one municipality but nearby residents live across the boundary, what should guarantee those neighboring residents a meaningful role before approvals are granted?
- What protections should prevent existing customers from carrying stranded costs if a large-load customer delays, downsizes or leaves?
- Would you support a federal transparency floor or grant conditions for large-load projects while preserving local authority over setbacks, noise, safety and land-use siting?

Source check

Primary and high-confidence sources used for factual claims in this packet. Campaign statements are identified as campaign statements and not treated as independent verification.

[1] City of Brighton, "City of Brighton and Brighton EDC Named 2026 Medium Community of the Year," Sept. 30, 2026

City statement on Brighton EDC support, governance links, incentive authority, the 80% Weld County industrial-land claim, enterprise-zone acreage, infrastructure investments and named employers including Crusoe AI.

<https://www.brightonco.gov/m/newsflash/home/detail/2978>

[2] City of Brighton, Long Range Planning, accessed Oct. 1, 2026

States that the replacement Comprehensive Plan remains a draft, hearings have not yet been scheduled, and the 2016 Be Brighton Comprehensive Plan remains in effect until adoption.

<https://www.brightonco.gov/553/Long-Range-Planning>

[3] Denver7, Project Silo reporting, Sept. 24, 2026

Reports an early-stage proposal of roughly 2.5 million square feet across eight two-story data-center buildings near County Road 4 and 50th Avenue.

<https://www.denver7.com/news/local-news/in-your-community/north-metro/brighton-residents-uncover-proposal-for-massive-data-center-campus-spurring-potential-moratorium>

[4] 9NEWS event information via Fort Collins Area Chamber of Commerce, Sept. 29 / Oct. 1, 2026

Lists the two televised Greeley town halls and says both CO-8 candidates declined invitations to the Oct. 1 debate/town hall; the Oct. 1 program instead features voters, advocates and industry leaders.

<https://fortcollinschamber.com/event/9news-town-halls-greeley-september-october-2026/>

[5] U.S. Government Publishing Office + U.S. House Clerk, H.R. 9340, Ratepayer Protection Act

Official bill text plus official House roll call. The House passed H.R. 9340 on Sept. 16, 2026, 417-3. The bill establishes a federal PURPA standard concerning allocation of full incremental grid-upgrade costs for large-load customers.

<https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/BILLS-119hr9340pcs/xhtml/BILLS-119hr9340pcs.html>

<https://clerk.house.gov/Votes/2026312>

[6] U.S. Senate, Roll Call Vote 254, Sept. 30, 2026

Official Senate roll-call record: the cloture motion on the motion to proceed to H.R. 9340 was rejected 57-43.

https://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/vote_menu_119_2.htm

[7] Rep. Gabe Evans, official district page

States that Colorado's 8th Congressional District includes most of Adams County and Weld County north through Greeley.

<https://gabeevans.house.gov/about/our-district>

[8] Manny Rutinel for Congress, official campaign site

Identifies Rutinel as a candidate for Colorado's 8th Congressional District. Candidate-position claims should be attributed to the campaign.

<https://www.mannyforcolorado.com/>

[9] 9NEWS, Lochbuie data-center moratorium report, Aug. 6, 2026

Reports Lochbuie approved a five-year pause on applications for new or expanded data centers, described by town leaders as proactive.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G8fbWIHG-ug>

[10] City of Brighton, Ordinance No. 2439 / marijuana-location restrictions

Brighton requires marijuana stores to be at least 1,000 feet from schools, residential child-care centers, halfway houses, correctional facilities and substance-abuse rehabilitation centers. The ordinance reviewed does not list churches or places of worship.

<https://www.brightonco.gov/DocumentCenter/View/29895>

[11] Weld County, Ordinance 2026-01 / Data Centers

Weld County adopted data-center-specific zoning standards in April 2026 for unincorporated land: data centers are limited to industrial zones, require public Use by Special Review in I-1 or Site Plan Review in I-2/I-3, and are prohibited in the agricultural zone.

<https://www.weld.gov/Government/Departments/Planning-and-Development-Services/Planning-and-Zoning/Long-range-Planning>

[12] City of Brighton Land Use & Development Code, Article 11 - Industrial uses

Brighton's code recognizes that industrial uses may create off-site impacts and may require special districts, more careful location criteria, or increased site-design and operational limitations.

https://library.municode.com/co/brighton/codes/land_use?nodeId=ART11DETE

[13] Weld County data-center operating standards

County data-center standards include a 65 dB(C) property-line noise limit, air- and water-quality compliance, and lighting controls; Weld County also requires a utility will-serve letter and proof of water under its adopted 2026 ordinance.

https://library.municode.com/co/weld_county/codes/charter_and_county_code?nodeId=CH23ZO_ARTIIPRPE_DIV6USSPREPEPIOMWA_S23-2-490DUBOCOCO

[14] Colorado General Assembly, SB26-102 Large-Load Data Centers

2026 proposal for large-load data-center accountability, including long-term utility contracts and electricity and water reporting. The Senate Transportation & Energy Committee postponed the bill indefinitely on May 11, 2026, 9-0.

<https://www.leg.colorado.gov/bills/SB26-102>

[15] Colorado General Assembly, HB26-1030 Data Center & Utility Modernization

2026 proposal creating a data-center development and incentive program and utility mechanisms for emerging large loads. The House Energy & Environment Committee postponed the bill indefinitely on May 7, 2026, 11-2.

<https://leg.colorado.gov/bills/HB26-1030>

[16] Colorado General Assembly, HB26-1030 committee vote, May 7, 2026

Official vote record shows Rep. Manny Rutinel voted yes on the motion to postpone HB26-1030 indefinitely.

https://leg.colorado.gov/committee_meeting_hearing_items/30887/votes