

TOWN OF LYONS  
BOULDER COUNTY IGA TASK FORCE MEETING  
MEETING  
LYONS TOWN HALL, 432 5 AVENUE, LYONS, COLORADO  
MINUTES  
July 9, 2024  
12:00 PM – 1:30 PM

- I. Roll Call - Julie Jacobs, Jen Wingard, Wendy Miller, Martin Soosloff, Sonny Smith, Cindy Fisher, Douglas Mathews, Charles Stevenson, Dave Hamrick (BoT liaison), Andrew Bowen (staff liaison), Hannah Hippley (BoCo)
- II. Approve Agenda – motion and second, agenda approved unanimously.
- III. Approve Min From 1-July-24 Meeting. Question about source for housing data that was provided, DM response that all data was extracted from town data and information. Motion and second, minutes approved unanimously.
- IV. Mayor Rogin Address To Task Force – Insight Into How The IGA Was Developed (Q&A) (20 Min). Mayor Rogin thanked the group for their participation. Reminder that most IGA discussions occur in executive session and that information cannot be disclosed per law, Mayor can only discuss her personal thought process. Noted that her considerations related to the 2 year long comp plan process – over 500 online comments about the comp plan and 100 people attended in person meetings, heard repeatedly that Lyons needs affordable housing – not formal Affordable Housing, but just housing that people can actually afford. Reality is that middle housing is a big need – teachers, firefighters, musicians – how can we house this population? Mayor went into IGA discussions with this thought in mind, noted that BoCo is a true partner in trying to help enable what Lyons said that it wanted. When considering specific parcels – we have professionals who can advise about issues like fire, utilities, etc. who would have to approve anything, so took a broader view of what might be possible as the IGA was developed. JW question – why the parcels specified and not others, is it because property owners in those parcels were interested in annexation? Yes, property owner interest did factor into what parcels were included in the draft. DM – how did density levels or affordable/attainable housing percentages come about? Mayor’s personal opinion was that she considered that smaller areas of density in larger parcels leads to smaller and more affordable housing units, so considered what would make the most sense on each parcel for density – least impact on infrastructure (easier for a cluster versus dispersed homes), looking for efficiencies. DM – why were there different percentages/amounts for different parcels? Andrew said this is based partly on what owners wanted, but also trying to fit the feel of each neighborhood. CS - when determining density and usage, were you considering total housing needs over time? Would approving this draft meet housing goals? AB – infill is always priority, but sometimes development is needed on the fringes, so wanted to allow these uses if possible and viable. Mayor - also thought about the larger statewide housing landscape – state is taking control over land use, did so last session and will keep doing so. Trying to advocate for local control of land use, want to be able to go to state legislators

and show what efforts we are making and gain some bargaining leverage with legislators, maybe they would exempt small towns from some of these land control laws. CW – Should affordable housing still be the goal after the 2 “pitchfork” meetings? Mayor – there were 600 comments on comp plan, overwhelming number of comments were supportive of affordable and attainable housing. Reminder that every property in the comp plan is not going to be annexed, Apple Valley has not annexed anything but has been on the map for years. Just trying to open up the possibilities knowing that there are multiple processes in place (fire, utilities, traffic) – why foreclose possibilities for the next 10 years? Hannah (BoCo) – all of us went into the process wanting to have an IGA – the town and county realize that the history of collaboration and the IGA framework are valuable and preferable to not having an IGA in place. If there is no IGA, every property is eligible for development. MS – We are tasked to be a voice for our community but know we don’t have all of the expertise to make specific recommendations about fire, utility, etc. Do you want a larger 30K view or a more specific view? Mayor - Higher level view – none of us are experts except for the experts. Task force was set up with the thought of allowing more community input without another 2 year comp plan process – they want the 30K view of what makes sense and if there are specific criteria to consider, they are happy to do so. They want our thoughts on the bigger parcel picture, the more detailed discussions happen in the BoT and with the county discussions. JW – what kind of thought process went into taking the detail of the 2012 IGA out of the 2024 draft. Mayor - Can’t discuss this due to executive session limitations. CW – concern about “rapid development” – we have never had 3 property owners wanting to sell and she thinks this will be rapidly developed. CS – one takeaway is how many safeguards and stopgaps there are in place, even if a property owner wants to try to do this, they have to find a buyer, find a developer and a plan, don’t see a real concern that this would develop rapidly with all of the requirements.

- V. Receive And If Needed, Discuss Data To Be Received By Staff From Lyons Fire And Utility Districts As Related To How They See These PAA Properties (10 Min) Assistant Fire Chief Pischke –When looking at annexations, they will look at access, water, how long it takes to get to the parcel from the station, evacuation concerns – what effect would development have if the town had to evacuate, how hard would it be? Fire Dept can’t pose opinions on parcels until they have a plan and idea of what the use would be. If a property is deemed problematic, they would recommend to the BoT that they reconsider the annexation. MS – do they make recommendations about how to make something more viable? It depends – infrastructure is what it is, but if there are other thoughts they can and do share them with a developer.  
Utilities from Andrew Bowen – from a utilities perspective, most of the parcels are green or yellow because there is almost always utilities potential for a parcel. JW – sprinkler requirements – needs more water pressure, concern that this might be a problem. Town staff and district would review this as part of the process and would not sign off on a project that can’t meet these requirements.
- VI. Receive / Review / Discuss Info From Staff On Updates Around Recent Annexation Parcels In Eastern Corridor (5 Min). AB update – Tebo has purchased 3 parcels, one will stay in county but no current development plans yet, just a straight annexation to

establish the zoning. MS was just curious about generally what is being planned. AB – there are 2 other property owners waiting to see if parcels are annexed so they can potentially apply. Tamborillo properties – south side, they have a good bit of stream frontage, campground where people can camp along the river and keep the historic property for the campground. North side of the property (in front of town's public works) – plans for a mixed use, small craft-makers space with living quarters above. Agreement that everything along the highway should be commercial, but plans for housing behind the frontage of commercial.

VII. WORKSHOP EFFORTS: (45 Min) Review Task Force Members Feedback On The Below Questions To Help Frame Our Areas Of Consideration For Recommendations To BOT:

Bottom line – do we have general consensus about what the criteria should be – go through them and see where we are aligned or not? DM presented a spreadsheet to rate each property on different elements. How to proceed? JW – stick with criteria and limit comments so we can get through it. WM, JJ, CS all think that all of the elements should and will be considered during an annexation application review. Back and forth about what the language of the IGA means and how enforceable it is – intent is to be able to use leverage that if someone wants to do housing, there has to be an affordability component, not just annexing in to build more millions dollar homes.

Motion from JJ and second from WM to recommend that all of the parcels on the map stay on the map. Discussion – we would not be agreeing to all of the detailed language in the IGA, just saying these are potentially annexable at some point. JW – question of the words not matching the map and the old map not matching the new map and how did we get to these changes? MS – concern about approving what is on the map now, not considering parcels that could be added. Vote on the motion - 3 yes (JJ, WM, CS), 3 no (DM, SS, CW), and 1 abstain (MS), motion dies from a lack of majority.

Discussion of how to proceed with revision to IGA language. CS - each of us can identify our own top few recommendations/driving considerations that inform our edits to the document to find a foundation of commonality that we can work from to form the recommendations. Send top recommendations/considerations and specific text edits to Doug by Sunday for posting and we can review prior to meeting, then brief presentation by each member of their ideas. CW wants to know what the opposition is to the old agreement. Can we identify sections of the old IGA that we want to include in the new one? This can be part of the suggested edits.

VIII. Summary Of Action Items - Send top recommendations/considerations and specific text edits to Doug by Sunday for posting and we can review prior to meeting, then brief presentation by each member of their ideas at next meeting.

IX. Set Agenda For 16- July Meeting: Discuss Issues And Changes Recommended To The Actual IGA Document

X. Adjournment - 1:34 PM