DISTRICT COURT, CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER, STATE OF COLORADO 1437 Bannock Street Denver, Colorado 80202 **Plaintiffs:** CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER, a home rule city and county; and CITY OF LITTLETON, a home rule municipality, v. **Defendant:** TOWN OF BOW MAR, a statutory town.	▲ COURT USE ONLY ▲
Attorneys for Plaintiff City and County of Denver: Matthew Mulbarger, #51918, Director, Municipal Operations Section Raana V. Haidari, #55729 Nathan J. Lucero, # 33908 Assistant City Attorneys, Municipal Operations Section 201 W. Colfax Ave., Dept. 1207, Denver, CO 80202 Telephone: (720) 913-3275 Email: matthew.mulbarger@denvergov.org; raana.haidari@denvergov.org; nathan.lucero@denvergov.org; *Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Littleton:* Reid B. Betzing, #33477 City Attorney, City of Littleton 2255 W. Berry Avenue, Littleton, CO 80120 Telephone: (303) 795-3730 Email: rbetzing@littletonco.gov Benjamin J. Bolinger, #50613 Bolinger Law pllc 5930 Eldora Ln, Colorado Springs, CO 80918 Telephone: (719) 321-6598 Email: ben@bolingerlawcos.com	Case Number: _____ Courtroom: _____
COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF	

Plaintiffs, the City and County of Denver and the City of Littleton, by and through undersigned counsel, submit this Complaint against Defendant, the Town of Bow Mar, and allege as follows:

PARTIES

1. Plaintiff City and County of Denver ("Denver") is a home rule city and county organized under Article XX of the Colorado Constitution, with its principal offices at 1437 Bannock Street, Denver, Colorado 80202. As a consolidated city and county, Denver exercises both municipal and county powers within its boundaries.

2. Plaintiff City of Littleton ("Littleton") is a home rule municipality organized under Article XX of the Colorado Constitution, with its principal offices at 2255 West Berry Avenue, Littleton, Colorado 80120.

3. Defendant Town of Bow Mar ("Bow Mar" or the "Town") is a statutory town organized under C.R.S. § 31-4-301 *et seq.*, located in Arapahoe and Jefferson Counties, with a business address of 7995 East Prentice Avenue, Suite 100, Greenwood Village, Colorado 80111.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under Colo. Const. art. VI, § 9; the Uniform Declaratory Judgments Law, C.R.S. §§ 13-51-101 to -115; and C.R.C.P. 57 and 65.

5. Venue is proper in the City and County of Denver under C.R.C.P. 98(a) and 98(b)(2) because this action affects public rights-of-way located, in whole or in part, within the City and County of Denver, and Plaintiffs' claims arise in part in Denver.

6. Plaintiffs seek only prospective declaratory and injunctive relief. Plaintiffs do not seek damages.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

A. The Regional Roadway Network

7. South Sheridan Boulevard ("Sheridan") is a public roadway running north and south. From West Quincy Avenue south to Bow Mar Drive, Sheridan forms the boundary between Bow Mar to the west and Denver's Fort Logan neighborhood to the east.

8. The Colorado Department of Transportation ("CDOT") classifies Sheridan, from the Bow Mar town limit to Bow Mar Drive, as a major collector. CDOT likewise classifies Bow Mar Drive (Sheridan to Prospect Drive), Prospect Drive (Bow Mar Drive to West Belleview Avenue), and West Belleview Avenue (Prospect Drive to the Bow Mar town limit) as major collectors.

9. Functional classification is the federal system, administered in Colorado by CDOT, that groups roadways by the function they serve in the road network. Under CDOT's guidance, collector roads gather traffic from local streets and carry it to the arterial network, while local streets provide access to abutting land and are "not designed to carry through traffic." Colo. Dep't of Transp., *Roadway Functional Classification Guidance Manual* 6 (Apr. 2024). CDOT's Online Transportation Information System ("OTIS") is the official repository of functional classification information in Colorado. *Id.* at 3.

10. Littleton owns and maintains the segment of West Belleview Avenue between South Perry Street and the Bow Mar town limits (the "Belleview Segment"). CDOT classifies the Belleview Segment as a major collector. The Belleview Segment has no intersecting streets within Littleton. Its only function is to connect Littleton's street network with Bow Mar's collector streets and, through them, with Sheridan, West Quincy Avenue, and Denver.

11. Sheridan has no residential driveways that back onto it north of West Tufts Avenue. At West Quincy Avenue, Sheridan is controlled by a traffic signal that Denver has

maintained since 1999 (the "Sheridan Signal"). Denver paid to rebuild the Sheridan Signal in 2005 for $2,000,000.

12. The Sheridan Signal provides a protected westbound turn onto West Quincy Avenue. It is one of only two signalized westbound exits, and the only signal providing passage north, for Denver's Fort Logan neighborhood south of West Quincy Avenue. It is used by residents of Denver, Littleton, and Bow Mar.

13. The next closest signal serving the Fort Logan neighborhood is at South Lowell Boulevard and West Quincy Avenue (the "Lowell Signal"), approximately one mile east of the Sheridan Signal. Northbound Lowell dead-ends at West Quincy Avenue, so the Lowell Signal provides no direct access to the north.

14. Sheridan and the Sheridan Signal provide the Fort Logan neighborhood's emergency route west to South Wadsworth Boulevard, where one emergency medical facility is located within approximately one mile of the Sheridan Signal, CareNow Urgent Care located at W. Qunicy and S. Wadsworth in Littleton. The next closest emergency medical facility is located 2.75 miles away, Common Spirit Emergency and Urgent Care, located at S. Wadsworth and Girton Avenue in Lakewood.

15. South Wolff Street and South Utica Street, which run north to West Quincy Avenue within Denver's Fort Logan neighborhood, are residential streets. Homes front on them, and residents back out of their driveways directly into the street. The intersections of Wolff and Utica with West Quincy Avenue are not signalized.

16. Bow Mar's own engineer, Matrix Design Group, has reported that Sheridan has an 80-foot right-of-way, of which Bow Mar maintains only the western 70 feet. Denver holds right

of way on Sheridan, including the intersection of Sheridan and West Tufts Avenue at the location where Bow Mar proposes to install the Sheridan Gate.

17. West Tufts Avenue ("Tufts") east of Sheridan lies within Denver and is owned and maintained by Denver, and Denver has a right-of-way.

18. On information and belief, Bow Mar reports its streets to CDOT as public streets for purposes of the Highway Users Tax Fund ("HUTF"), and its share of HUTF distributions is based in part on that street mileage. CDOT's road inventory for Bow Mar lists 9.22 centerline miles of Bow Mar roads, including 1.15 miles of major roads: Sheridan (0.63 mile), Bow Mar Drive (0.25 mile), Prospect Drive (0.22 mile), and West Belleview Avenue (0.05 mile). CDOT paid Bow Mar $36,589.25 in HUTF payments during calendar year 2025 and $30,961.20 from January 1 through October 20, 2026.

19. On information and belief, Bow Mar obtained a $455,400 grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (Grant No. B-24-CP-CO-0428), sought on the basis that increased traffic on the streets providing access to public open space had deteriorated those streets, and designated those funds for its 2025 road paving program, which included its collector streets.

20. Sheridan and Bow Mar's other collector streets have been open to and continuously used by the public for many years, including by residents of Denver, Littleton, and Bow Mar, and by emergency responders serving all three communities.

B. Bow Mar's Gate Project

21. Beginning in September 2025, Bow Mar's Board of Trustees (the "Board") considered installing gates and closing streets to restrict traffic by nonresidents passing through the Town. On February 9, 2026, the Board adopted Resolution 2026-04, which provided for

further consideration of Sheridan as the location for a gate and approved the closure of Tufts at Sheridan. On March 16, 2026, the Board adopted, as amended, its "Resolution Regarding Gate Design and Installation and Other Traffic Mitigation Measures on Town Roads for Public Safety Purposes," which Resolution 2026-10 identifies as Resolution 2026-05. As described in Resolution 2026-10, that resolution approved the gate installation at Sheridan, traffic calming devices at three locations, and a budget not to exceed $310,000. The design presented with it places barrier and swing gates across Sheridan at the Sunset Drive roundabout. On April 20, 2026, the Board adopted Resolution 2026-10, approving the installation of double barrier arm gates at the Prospect Street roundabout and a budget of up to $100,000 for their final design. A true and correct copy of Resolution 2026-10 is attached as Exhibit 1.

22. In August 2026, Bow Mar officials met with representatives of Denver and Littleton regarding the gate project. Neither Denver nor Littleton consented to any gate or closure of a public roadway.

23. On September 21, 2026, the Board considered a resolution that would repeal and replace Resolutions 2026-04, the March 16 resolution, and 2026-10 with gates at Sunset Drive and Sheridan and south of Tufts at Sheridan and a closure or gate at Longhorn, and a second resolution that would establish a schedule for closing the gates. The draft minutes of that meeting state that the Board took no action on the schedule resolution and approved the gate-location resolution. Resolutions 2026-04, the March 16 resolution, and 2026-10, and the September 21 gate-location resolution to the extent the Board adopted it, are referred to together as the "Gate Resolutions." True and correct copies of the gate-location resolution as presented to the Board on September 21, 2026, and of the draft minutes of that meeting, are attached as Exhibits 2 and 3.

24. Bow Mar has moved to build the gates. On May 27, 2026, the Board approved a contract with Wizard Works Security Systems, Inc. ("Wizard Works") to install them. On October 19, 2026, the Board considered Resolution 2026-29, approving a new service agreement with Wizard Works for the design, construction, and installation of the gates and closure (the "Wizard Works Agreement"). The Wizard Works Agreement recites that the Town "has approved the installation of gates at Sheridan Boulevard and Prospect Drive, as well as the closure of West Tufts Avenue." Its price is $306,879.24. It requires construction in two phases: Phase 1 is the closure of Tufts and the gate at Sheridan, and Phase 2 is the gate at Prospect. True and correct copies of Resolution 2026-29 and the Wizard Works Agreement, as presented to the Board on October 19, 2026, are attached as Exhibit 4. True and correct copies of the engineering drawings for the gates prepared by CAGE Engineering, Inc. and dated October 16, 2026 (the "CAGE Drawings") are attached as Exhibit 5.

25. Under the Wizard Works Agreement and the CAGE Drawings, Bow Mar will install (a) barrier arm gates across Sheridan at the Sunset Drive roundabout, with entry and exit lanes, keypads, vehicle tag readers, and license plate recognition cameras (the "Sheridan Gate"); (b) a row of fixed and collapsible bollards across the mouth of Tufts at Sheridan, on the Denver boundary (the "Tufts Closure"); and (c) barrier arm gates across Prospect Street on the north side of the Prospect Street and West Belleview Avenue roundabout, where Bow Mar has blocked Prospect Street with Jersey barriers since October 2025 (the "Prospect Gates," and together with the Sheridan Gate and the Tufts Closure, the "Gates"). Sheridan forms the boundary between Bow Mar and Denver, and Tufts is a Denver street.

26. None of the Gate Resolutions limits the hours during which the Gates may be closed or sets an end date for their operation. The gate system presented to the Board would keep

the Gates closed to general traffic and open them for residents with vehicle tags or a phone app, for guests and delivery services with codes, and for emergency vehicles. Wizard Works priced resident access at a monthly fee for each of 300 homes. The Board did not adopt a proposed resolution that would have set a schedule for closing the gate arms to restrict what it called "cut through traffic in Bow Mar." Bow Mar has thus reserved to itself the discretion to close the Gates at any time and for any duration.

27. Bow Mar justifies the Gates on the ground that its streets are residential, lack sidewalks, and have limited street lighting, so that traffic endangers people walking, cycling, and playing in the street. The Gate Resolutions make no finding about the safety of the streets onto which the Gates would divert that traffic.

28. On September 21, 2026, the Board approved a professional services agreement with CAGE Engineering, Inc. for concept design of the Gates. That agreement does not include a traffic study of the Gates' effect on streets outside Bow Mar.

29. The Gates are permanent installations designed to close public streets to general traffic at Bow Mar's discretion for an indefinite period, and the closure of Tufts is permanent. Any closure at Tufts would require vacation of the Denver right-of-way, which would require approval by Denver’s City Council.

30. Bow Mar has not established detours or alternative routing for the traffic the Gates would exclude, and, on information and belief, has not obtained any traffic engineering study evaluating the Gates' effect on Denver and Littleton streets.

31. Bow Mar has not obtained Denver's approval, acting either as a county or as a city, for any gate on, closure of, or vacation of any part of Sheridan or Tufts. Denver has not

given that approval. Any closure at Tufts would require vacation of the Denver right-of-way, which would require approval by Denver's City Council.

C. The Gates Would Divert Through Traffic onto Less Safe Residential Streets

32. Whenever the Gates are closed, traffic that now uses Sheridan, the Sheridan Signal, and Bow Mar's collector streets would be forced onto other routes.

33. Traffic diverted from Sheridan and traveling to or from West Quincy Avenue would be pushed onto residential streets in Denver and would enter West Quincy Avenue at unsignalized intersections.

34. Moving traffic off a signalized collector onto residential streets, where residents back out of their driveways into the street and where drivers must enter a busy arterial without a signal, increases the risk of collisions with backing vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists, and children, and of turning collisions at the unsignalized intersections on West Quincy Avenue.

35. Drivers diverted onto Wolff, Quitman, Newton, and Utica who need to travel west or north would have to turn left across West Quincy Avenue without a signal or protected turn, or travel east to the Lowell Signal, which provides no access to the north.

36. The diversion inverts the functional hierarchy on which the regional road network is planned and built. It removes through traffic from roads classified to carry it and places that traffic on local streets that are not designed, classified, or intended to carry it. Bow Mar's own engineer, Matrix Design Group, told the Board that although the Town's roadway system "consists of only local roads," more than half of the trips on the roadways it studied are not associated with Town residents, and "the studied roadways are effectively functioning as collector facilities." Matrix Design Group, Technical Memorandum at 2 (Nov. 14, 2025), in Town of Bow Mar Board of Trustees Meeting Packet at 19 (Feb. 9, 2026).

37. The conditions Bow Mar cites to justify the Gates, residential frontage and the presence of people in the street, exist equally or to a greater degree on the Denver and Littleton streets that would receive the diverted traffic. The Gates do not eliminate the risk Bow Mar identifies; they shift it to the residents of Denver and Littleton.

38. The Gates are inconsistent with how the region's streets are planned and used, including by Bow Mar itself. Bow Mar's Roads Asset Management Plan identifies Sheridan from the Town entrance to Bow Mar Drive, Bow Mar Drive from Sheridan to the Berry curve, and Prospect from Bow Mar Drive to the Belleview entrance as the Town's "major arterials." Town of Bow Mar, Roads Asset Management Plan at 26 (Feb. 2024); see also id. at 24 (listing the same roads as "main arterials").

D. Harm to Denver

39. The Gates would increase traffic volumes and collision risk on Wolff, Utica, and other Denver residential and collector streets, endangering Denver residents who back out of their driveways or walk, cycle, and play on those streets.

40. The Gates would move traffic away from the Sheridan Signal, which Denver has maintained since 1999 and paid to rebuild, and onto unsignalized intersections that Denver would be required to monitor and may be required to reconfigure or signalize.

41. The Tufts Closure would cut a Denver street off from Sheridan without Denver's consent, depriving Denver of the use of its own roadway.

42. Without Sheridan, emergency personnel serving the Fort Logan neighborhood would have to route through its residential streets, increasing response times and adding emergency traffic to streets where residents back out of their driveways.

43. Fort Logan residents would lose their most direct signalized route west to South Wadsworth Boulevard and the medical care located there.

44. The Gates would increase traffic, wear, and maintenance costs on the Denver streets that would receive the diverted traffic.

E. Harm to Littleton

45. The Gates would cut the through connection that gives the Belleview Segment its public function. Because the Sheridan Gate and the Prospect Gates would prevent traffic entering Bow Mar on Belleview from continuing across Bow Mar's collector streets to Sheridan and West Quincy Avenue whenever the Gates are closed, the Belleview Segment would become, in substance, a dead end serving only Bow Mar.

46. Littleton would continue to bear the cost of maintaining, repairing, sweeping, and plowing the Belleview Segment, a major collector, while the Gates would convert its benefit to the exclusive use of Bow Mar residents. Bow Mar would thereby appropriate the value of Littleton's public right-of-way and public investment without Littleton's consent.

47. Traffic that now uses the Belleview Segment and Bow Mar's collector streets would be diverted onto other Littleton streets, including residential streets, increasing traffic volumes, collision risk, pavement wear, and maintenance costs.

48. Diverted traffic would increase demand at other Littleton intersections and signals and may require signal retiming, additional traffic control, and other expenditures by Littleton.

49. The Gates would impair Littleton residents' access to public open space in and adjacent to Bow Mar, including Mary's Meadow, a Denver open space on the south side of Marston Reservoir.

F. An Actual Controversy Exists

50. Bow Mar has adopted the Gate Resolutions authorizing the Gates, approved budgets for them, retained CAGE Engineering to design them, approved a contract with Wizard Works to install them, and on October 19, 2026 considered the Wizard Works Agreement to build them, beginning with the Tufts Closure and the Sheridan Gate. Unless restrained, Bow Mar will construct and operate the Gates. An actual, present controversy exists between Plaintiffs and Defendant regarding Bow Mar's authority to do so.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Declaratory Judgment: The Gates Exceed Bow Mar's Authority to Close Streets (C.R.S. § 42-4-111(1)(x) and (y); C.R.C.P. 57)

51. Plaintiffs incorporate paragraphs 1 through 50 as if fully restated herein.

52. A statutory town possesses only those powers expressly granted by the General Assembly and those necessarily implied from them, and if a doubt exists as to the municipality's power, the doubt must be resolved against the municipality. City of Aurora v. Bogue, 489 P.2d 1295, 1296 (Colo. 1971). C.R.S. § 42-4-111(1)(x) authorizes a local authority, on streets under its jurisdiction, to close a street or a portion of a street only "temporarily," and only while establishing appropriate detours or alternative routing.

53. The Gates are not temporary. They are permanent structures that Bow Mar may close at its discretion with no end date, and the closure of Tufts is permanent. Bow Mar has not established detours or alternative routing.

54. C.R.S. § 42-4-111(1)(y), which authorizes local authorities to regulate local traffic movement "where such is not provided for in this article," does not authorize the Gates. Closure of streets is provided for in subsection (1)(x), and subsection (1)(y) cannot be read to authorize indefinite closures that subsection (1)(x) does not permit.

55. Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaration that the Gate Resolutions exceed Bow Mar's authority under C.R.S. § 42-4-111(1) and are void to the extent they authorize the construction or operation of gates to close public streets to general traffic indefinitely.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Declaratory Judgment: The Gates Are Not a Reasonable Exercise of the Police Power (C.R.S. § 42-4-111(1); C.R.C.P. 57)

56. Plaintiffs incorporate paragraphs 1 through 55 as if fully restated herein.

57. Whatever authority C.R.S. § 42-4-111(1) grants local authorities over streets under their jurisdiction may be exercised only "within the reasonable exercise of the police power."

58. The Gates are not a reasonable exercise of the police power. They do not reduce the traffic risks Bow Mar identifies; they transfer those risks from Bow Mar's collector streets to residential streets in Denver and Littleton that are less suited to carry traffic.

59. The Gates close roads that CDOT classifies as major collectors and that the regional transportation system relies on to carry traffic. They do so to exclude nonresident traffic from roads that Bow Mar certifies to the State as open to the public in order to receive Highway Users Tax Fund distributions.

60. Bow Mar adopted the Gates without any traffic engineering study of their effect on neighboring streets, without detours or alternative routing, and without any finding that the diverted traffic could be safely accommodated elsewhere.

61. Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaration that the Gate Resolutions and the Wizard Works Agreement are not a reasonable exercise of the police power, exceed Bow Mar's authority under C.R.S. § 42-4-111(1), and are void.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Declaratory Judgment: Vacation of a Boundary Roadway without Joint Action (C.R.S. § 43-2-303; C.R.C.P. 57)

62. Plaintiffs incorporate paragraphs 1 through 61 as if fully restated herein.

63. C.R.S. § 43-2-303(1)(c) provides that a roadway forming the boundary between two counties may be vacated only by the joint action of the boards of county commissioners of both counties, and C.R.S. § 43-2-303(1)(d) provides that a roadway forming the boundary line of a city or town may be vacated only by joint action of the board of county commissioners and the governing body of the city or town. Sheridan forms the boundary between Bow Mar and Denver and, on information and belief, between Jefferson County and Denver. Denver exercises county powers within its boundaries.

64. C.R.S. § 43-2-303(2)(a) states: "No platted or deeded roadway or part thereof or unplatted or undefined roadway which exists by right of usage shall be vacated so as to leave any land adjoining said roadway without an established public road or private-access easement connecting said land with another established public road."

65. The Sheridan right-of-way along the Bow Mar boundary is owned in part by Denver and in part by Bow Mar. A gate on Sheridan on the boundary of Denver and Bow Mar would unlawfully vacate the public right-of-way of Sheridan because Denver has not agreed to the boundary line being vacated. Similarly, any closure of Tufts by Bow Mar would also constitute an unlawful vacation of Sheridan and Tufts because Denver has not agreed to any such closure.

66. The Tufts Closure and the Sheridan Gate will be in violation of C.R.S. § 43-2-303(1)(c) and (d).

67. The Tufts Closure and the Sheridan Gate would unlawfully vacate the public right-of-way for Denver's Fort Logan residents and prevent Denver residents' usage of the

Sheridan Signal for a safe westbound turn out of the neighborhood in violation of C.R.S. § 43-2-303(2)(a).

68. Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaration that any gate or closure that operates as a vacation of Sheridan, Tufts, or any other boundary roadway is void absent compliance with C.R.S. § 43-2-303, including the joint action required by subsection (1)(c) and (d).

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Preliminary and Permanent Injunctive Relief (C.R.C.P. 65)

69. Plaintiffs incorporate paragraphs 1 through 68 as if fully restated herein.

70. Plaintiffs have a reasonable probability of success on the merits of their claims.

71. Construction and operation of the Gates would cause Plaintiffs real, immediate, and irreparable injury, including increased collision risk to residents on Denver and Littleton streets, loss of the use and control of public rights-of-way, loss of the function of the Belleview Segment, impairment of emergency response routes, and diversion of traffic onto Plaintiffs' streets. Injuries to persons that result from diverted traffic cannot be undone, and once the Gates are built and in operation, these injuries cannot be adequately remedied after trial.

72. Plaintiffs have no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law. Plaintiffs do not seek damages, and damages could not restore the lawful use of the affected roadways or undo collisions caused by diverted traffic.

73. An injunction would serve the public interest by preserving the safety of the regional road network, established public roadways, regional connectivity, and emergency access pending a determination of Bow Mar's authority. The balance of equities favors Plaintiffs, and an injunction would preserve the status quo: the roadways are open today.

74. Plaintiffs are municipal corporations of the State of Colorado and are not required to give security under C.R.C.P. 65(c). Plaintiffs will move separately for a preliminary injunction.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request that the Court enter judgment in their favor and against Defendant as follows:

A. A declaration that the Gate Resolutions and the Wizard Works Agreement exceed Bow Mar's authority under C.R.S. § 42-4-111(1)(x) and (y) and are void to the extent they authorize gates that close public streets to general traffic indefinitely;

B. A declaration that the Gate Resolutions and the Wizard Works Agreement are not a reasonable exercise of the police power under C.R.S. § 42-4-111(1) and are void;

C. A declaration that any gate or closure that operates as a vacation of a boundary roadway is void absent compliance with C.R.S. § 43-2-303, including the joint action required by subsection (1)(c) and (d);

D. Preliminary and permanent injunctions prohibiting Defendant from constructing, installing, or operating the Gates;

E. Attorneys' fees and costs as allowed by law; and

F. Such other relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Dated this ____ day of November, 2026.

_____
Raana V. Haidari, #55729
Assistant City Attorney
Attorney for Plaintiff City and County of Denver

_____
Benjamin J. Bolinger, #50613
Bolinger Law pllc
Attorney for Plaintiff City of Littleton

Plaintiffs' Addresses:
City and County of Denver, 1437 Bannock Street, Denver, Colorado 80202
City of Littleton, 2255 West Berry Avenue, Littleton, Colorado 80120

Exhibits:
Exhibit 1: Resolution 2026-10 (adopted April 20, 2026)
Exhibit 2: Resolution Regarding Construction and Installation of Gates, as presented to the Board on September 21, 2026
Exhibit 3: Draft Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting of September 21, 2026
Exhibit 4: Resolution 2026-29 and Service Agreement with Wizard Works Security Systems, Inc., as presented to the Board on October 19, 2026
Exhibit 5: CAGE Engineering, Inc., Bow Mar Entry Gates Drawings (Oct. 16, 2026)