Ordinance Subcommittee
Watertown Town Council
Special Meeting

Tuesday, October 20, 2026 –5:30 p.m.

Watertown Town Hall
Town Council Chambers
61 Echo Lake Rd

SPECIAL MEETING

1. Call meeting to order.
   Meeting called to order at 5:30 p.m.

   Chairman Robert Desena led the pledge of allegiance.

   Sub-committee Robert Desena stated I wanted to give a little background on the Town Ordinances. The Town Ordinances are codified and enacted under the following: Sections 12-31inclusive and 12-232, 12-234. For those of interest please refer to the town website, Town of Watertown, Ct., government ordinances and its self-explanatory about the ordinances.

2. Roll call.
   Subcommittee Members: Robert Desena – Sub-committee Chair, Tom DeMatteis, Ken Demirs, Carina Noyd,

   Others present: Attorney Paul Jessell

3. Public Participation

   Sub-committee Chair Robert Desena we are going to utilize the public participation policy.

   Frankie Popilowski (inaudible)

   Michael Jeff (inaudible)

   Lasha Corbett stated she opposed the speed cameras they infringe on privacy rights of the people in town. I think it could lead to prioritization of revenue over safety and other kinds aspects. It could undermine public trust in local government. There is potential that it could disproportionately burden the lower income residents of our town.

Alan Garceau stated he is opposed to the cameras and felt this is not the right course of action to slow down speeding. I first hand witnessed this because my friend lives 3 houses down from a speed camera and all the cars slow down just enough and floor it 100 miles an hour because they are upset at the camera, it creates an extra burden to their house. We all go a few miles over the speed limit, but our cars nowadays could easily travel that fast. There are only a select few people that do abuse the speeds. We need to go after those select few instead of the citizens that live in this town that have to travel everyday by the camera and risk getting a ticket over a few miles an hour over the speed limit.

Amanda Manforte stated she stated she wished she could say yes to this because I would love for him to learn his lesson that way. I am also a victim of domestic violence by the hands of a first responder. We know that domestic violence involving police officers and their partners is a documented problem. There are also documented cases of law enforcement officers misusing flock cameras across the United States, including stalking people, conducting unauthorized searches and sharing access with unauthorized individuals. During this month of domestic violence awareness, I urge this council to read further into these cases and how this impacted the safety of women, children and families if there are no safe guards in place to ensure these reads are not misused by officers and others who have access to this information. I feel strongly there are too many unknowns regarding flock cameras, their information collecting technology, and how that is shared to move forward without further investigation and answers to the many questions and concerns residents have brought this evening. I believe this should not move forward to Town Council before this information is gathered and the safety of our citizens and our information is guaranteed first.

Joe Pawlak stated in the minority I am in favor of the speed cameras. Living on Middlebury Road for over 50 years, I am fully aware of the problems with speeders in this town. I know the Police Department, the patrol division, can in no way enforce speed limits adequately or effectively. It is an overwhelming problem and they do not have the manpower to do it. The speed cameras would remind people that are concerned about privacy that the possession of a driver's license is not a right, it is a privilege subject to conditions and requirements. The speed cameras as I understand it, the violator's actions are not reported to the Department of Motor Vehicles. There is no record of their infractions on their licenses or their insurance companies are not notified either, it's strictly a local situation. I do not know the sharing of information with respect to what's recorded on the cameras, although I believe the camera's information is actuated only when the speeds are exceeded. The State of Connecticut nothing happens until a driver exceeds a posted speed limit by 10 miles an hour and then the flag is raised and a traffic violation or ticket is sent out to the individual. I urge the subcommittee and the Town Council to take favorable action on this.

Denise Russ, 135 Porter Street stated I am also in favor of the speed cameras because nowadays people are driving like there are no rules, no limits and it is no pleasure anymore. I am all for it they get caught, they get a ticket or whatever because things have to start changing. People just drive so radical, you take your own life in your hands just driving down Main Street.

Dan Cocchiola stated that that this is one of the biggest most important projects that you as a subcommittee of the council are going to be working on. I can't think of anything more important than the position between our privacy and our safety. I am grateful to have you all four here because I know you are going to take all the seriousness it needs. There are facts that were talked about tonight already and making the best possible decision. Thank you for your work, I am truly grateful. I am going through my points quickly. I believe these cameras create a surveillance state. I believe they are constitutionally questionable. I believe they do not make us safer and I believe that if safety is a concern, we need to personalize it better with human beings. I believe it is a regressive tax, it really hits hard the people who can afford it the least.

Carina Noyd stated we have 6 letters that came in by email and I will read those. These are folks who were unable to physically be present for public participation and wanted their thoughts heard.

Katherine Camara
See attached

Krista Palomba
See attached

Jennifer Jedd
See attached

Vic Vicenzi
See attached

Serena Cestari
See attached

Barbara Zulkeski
See attached

Richard Rozanski
See attached

4. Discussion and possible action on Noise Ordinance amendment/corrections needed.

Town Attorney Paul Jessell stated in 2022 the Noise Ordinance was taken under advisement by the Ordinance Sub-committee. My office did not handle that for reasons that are irrelevant here. The purpose of that had to do with amplified noise or amplified sound. The ordinance that came out of that is in your packets beginning with Section 12-34 of the ordinance sets down purpose and continues through 12-44. That ordinance modification was passed but in doing so we left out the first 3 sections of our original noise ordinance which was not an issue in that situation. The first 3 sections 12-31, 12-32 and 12-33 had to do with construction activities and refuse haulers. Those were erroneously left out of the ordinance as it was finally codified. I don't believe that was intended. My understanding from all of the comments and reviewing all the minutes of

that ordinance sub-committee it was not intended to repeal those sections, is just that the only sections that were being changed were the ones having to do with amplified sound. Therefore, I recommending that this body vote to declare that was a scrivener's error in eliminating those three sections 12-31, 12-32 and 12-33, add those back in to the ordinance and then in the title section of 12-34 we add the word amplified in front of noise. So, 12-31 will begin just noise and 12-34 will be titled amplified noise. They each have their own purpose section it is a little bit of duplication but the purpose section of the amplified noise points out this is specific to that particular issue which is amplified noise. There is one other minor issue, in section 12-38 of what was the new ordinance, there was a mistake at the time it was codified. In 12-38 subsection 2, when it originally came out, the section referred to in there, which you see as 13-41, was originally written as 13-82. The Town Council voted in 23 to make that correction and change it to 12-41. You can see that the codifiers made it 13-41. What I believe is a scrivener's error and not in compliance with what the council actually voted. I would recommend that as part of what you do tonight you send back that minor change as well.

Carina Noyd stated I know this is a welcome change. I know personally I had to change pickup services because they were coming at 4:30 a.m.

Attorney Paul Jessell stated it wasn't until someone raised the issue of early trash pickups that I was given the assignment to figure out what happened to that section.

Motion: Ken Demirs I move that ordinance sub-committee recommend to the full Town Council the following: section's 12-31, 12-32, and 12-34 be reinserted into the code of ordinance and the heading for 12-34 be amended to add the word amplified. Also, in section 12-38 subsection 2, we are going to change the 13-41 to 12-41.

Attorney Paul Jessell can I make a recommendation for an amendment to that motion. You said 12-31, 12-32 and 12-34. It should be 12-31, 12-32 and 12-33 be added to the ordinance and before 12-34 we make the change.

Ken Demirs stated I am going to amend the motion to read 12-31, 12-32, and 12-33 be reinserted and at 12-34 the word amplified will be added. Everything else remains the same. Carina Noyd seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously

5. Discussion and possible action on establishing a speed camera ordinance, including a vote on whether to recommend that the Town Councill schedule a public hearing to receive comments on the proposed ordinance.

Robert Desena stated I wanted to clarify what I had mentioned under the Town of Watertown, Ct. Chapter Two Administration, Chapter Three Code of Ordinances, please refer to that. Section 1-1 is how the code is designated in signing, Section 1-2 Definition of Rules of Construction. Then we go down to two very important subsections, Section 6 the Code of Ordinances the Town of Watertown has designated throughout the section and finally, Subsection 7 the Town Council's role meaning the governing body of the Town of Watertown. Therefore, based on public interest that we listen to tonight is going to be recommended prior to formulation of an ordinance concerning speed cameras and the enforcement thereof.

Motion: Robert Desena seconded by Ken Demis: I make a motion that the ordinance subcommittee recommend to the council that a future Town Council meeting, the council will establish a public hearing to hear public comments at that time on the formulation of an ordinance regarding speed cameras.

Motion passes unanimously

6. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 6:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

_____

Robert Desena, Subcommittee Chair
Watertown Town Council

From: Katherine Camara <ctgadflygirl@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2026 10:25 AM
To: Carina Noyd; Robert Desena; Ken Demirs; Tom DeMatteis; Town Manager; Town Council
Subject: Ordinance Subcommittee Meeting 10/20/26

Dear Committee Members,

I don't believe I can be in attendance at the meeting tonight so please accept my comments below.

As to the noise ordinance - we have had an ordinance prohibiting garbage collection and such work to begin on our roads prior to 6:00 am - which mysteriously disappeared. Please restore that ordinance but also ask Town management to determine if any other ordinances have been changed or removed inappropriately.

As to the speed cameras - you need to refuse to propose an ordinance until the Town calls a well publicized public hearing to determine if the residents of Watertown and Oakville want speed cameras to be installed in our Town. Without the voices of the residents, how can you thoughtfully craft an ordinance?

Thank you.
Katherine Camara

FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

October 20, 2026

Councilwoman Carina Noyd:

I want to say up front that I care about safe roads. I drive these streets every day, I live on Echo Lake, and I've seen people fly through here like it's the Indy 500. So I get why speed cameras sound like a good idea. I just don't think they're the right fix for Watertown and Oakville.

A camera can mail someone a ticket, but it can't pull over a drunk driver. It can't see that someone's texting. It can't fix a blind curve or a crosswalk nobody can see at night. Maybe people slow down for the few hundred feet in front of the camera, but then what? That's not the same as real enforcement, and it's not the same as making our roads safer.

Before the town signs on to anything, I'd like some honest answers.

Where's the proof we need this? I'd like to see the traffic studies, accident reports, and complaints that point to these specific spots.

Have we tried other things first? More police patrols, better signs, those flashing "your speed is" signs, speed bumps, better road design. Those should come first.

Who's making money here? I want to know what it costs, who the vendor is, what the contract says, how much the tickets would bring in, and where that money goes. Do you sense a FOIA request coming on? If not, you should.

What happens to the photos? These cameras record license plates and take pictures of our cars. Who gets to see that, and how long do they keep it?

And where does it stop? Once a few cameras go up, what keeps more from going up later, in places nobody voted on?

Yes, state law allows towns to do this under certain rules. But just because we're allowed to doesn't mean we should. This is a small town. I'd rather we spend our time and money on things that actually make people safer, not on more surveillance and more fines for the people who live and work here.

I'm all for safer streets. I'm all for protecting kids and people on foot. I just don't believe every safety problem needs another camera and another ticket in the mail.

If Watertown is going to move forward with this, residents deserve to see the evidence, know exactly where the money goes, have a real say, and know that other options were seriously tried first.

Let's work on safer roads, not more cameras. Please join me in saying NO to speed cameras in Watertown and Oakville.

Sincerely,

Krista Palomba
480 Echo Lake Rd.
Watertown

Lisa Cattaneo

From: Carina Noyd
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2026 6:15 PM
To: Lisa Cattaneo
Subject: Fw: Speed cameras

Carina Noyd, MSN-Ed, RN
Town Council Member
M: (203) 910-2063

From: Jennifer Jedd <jenjedd114@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 20 October 2026 17:08:39
To: Carina Noyd <Noyd@watertownct.org>
Subject: Speed cameras

To whom it may concern,
I am unable to make the meeting tonight due to a work conflict.
I am very much in favor for putting up a speed camera ticketing system on Bunker Hill Road. I live here and on many occasions here are recurring issues:
-Speeding- I have never held a radar gun but I am sure most of it is over 10 mph over 30
-Excessive backfiring and muffler noises
-Street racing and burnouts at night time
-Unregistered quads and dirt bikes
-People driving on the opposite side going up the blind hill to avoid a bump because they are going too fast to traverse the bump at a normal speed
-i get passed on a weekly (sometimes daily) basis on BHR and/or on quassapaug road on my way to work in Woodbury- over the double yellow line and often on blind turn areas- there are no passing areas and often bicycles and runners

I thank every cop who comes and sits and have been told by all of them that it is a dangerous location for them to be able to pull over a car. Understandably.

I lost my dog on the road recently and it spoiled a social media thing and I am in no way looking for vindication- I am at fault for my dog being in the road but she flew and was in my neighbors driveway which is a significant distance from impact, and I can't help but to think that if the person was not texting and was going the speed limit they may have seen her. I am also so thankful this was not a person. My friend runs on this road every day with her young kids in a stroller, and there are many other walkers runners and bikers. I am afraid of this road and would like to advocate for a speed ticketing system which will make our road safer, quieter, and more habitable. It will also ensure that our laws are being followed, and not risk the safety of our police personnel while doing so. Let's keep Watertown a safe place to live.

My friend was caught by a ticketing system in Washington ct that was billed to their house yet did not have further pursuit of the balance was paid in full promptly, this could also be a way to make some money to support our town's safety as well while allowing our police to patrol other areas safely.

Thank you

Jennifer jedd
Resident
1439 bunker Hill Rd, Watertown, CT 06795

Lisa Cattaneo

From: Carina Noyd
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2026 6:16 PM
To: Lisa Cattaneo
Subject: Fw: No to speed cameras

Carina Noyd, MSN-Ed, RN
Town Council Member
M: (203) 910-2063

From: Vic Vicenzi <vicenzi@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 20 October 2026 16:58:56
To: Carina Noyd <Noyd@watertownct.org>; Ken Demirs <Demirs@watertownct.org>; Tom DeMatteis <Dematteis@watertownct.org>; Robert Desena <Desena@watertownct.org>
Subject: No to speed cameras

I write you to voice my opposition to spped cameras being installed around town! Thank you!

Vic Vicenzi III

Lisa Cattaneo

From: Carina Noyd
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2026 6:16 PM
To: Lisa Cattaneo
Subject: Fw: Flock cameras

Carina Noyd, MSN-Ed, RN
Town Council Member
M: (203) 910-2063

From: Serena <sccestari22@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 20 October 2026 16:48:01
To: Carina Noyd <Noyd@watertownct.org>
Subject: Flock cameras

I am writing to oppose flock cameras in our town. They have too many privacy issues, too many people have access or can gain access to them. I for one do not want to sign up to have my daily comings and goings be documented and stored for anyone to see. This is mass surveillance and has no place in the so called land of the free. Please do not bring them to our town!

Serena Cestari
288 Davis st. Oakville

Lisa Cattaneo

From: Carina Noyd
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2026 6:16 PM
To: Lisa Cattaneo
Subject: Fw: Formal Opposition and Request for Public Accountability - Proposed Camera Systems

Carina Noyd, MSN-Ed, RN
Town Council Member
M: (203) 910-2063

From: Barbara Zulkeski <bcarpentiere@att.net>
Sent: Tuesday, 20 October 2026 13:24:13
To: Carina Noyd <Noyd@watertownct.org>; Robert Desena <Desena@watertownct.org>; Ken Demirs <Demirs@watertownct.org>; Tom DeMatteis <Dematteis@watertownct.org>
Subject: Formal Opposition and Request for Public Accountability - Proposed Camera Systems

Good Afternoon,

I am writing to formally express my **strong opposition** to the proposed installation of Flock license plate recognition cameras and automated speed enforcement cameras in Watertown and Oakville.

I understand that a public meeting has been scheduled to discuss these technologies. However, holding a meeting during hours when many residents are working or commuting raises legitimate concerns about accessibility and meaningful public participation. Decisions involving taxpayer dollars, personal privacy, and government surveillance deserve more than a meeting that a significant portion of the community may be unable to attend.

Since I cannot attend, I request that this correspondence be **entered into the public record, distributed to every subcommittee member, and acknowledged before any recommendation or decision is made.**

My concerns are outlined below.

1. **Privacy, Surveillance, and Government Overreach**

Flock cameras have the capability to collect license plate numbers, vehicle descriptions, locations, and timestamps. While I recognize their potential value to law enforcement, these systems also collect information about law-abiding residents conducting their everyday activities.

Before considering implementation, the Town should provide clear, written answers to the following questions:

- Who will have access to the collected information, and under what circumstances?
- How long will the information be retained?
- Will this data be shared with outside law enforcement agencies, municipalities, or third parties?

- What safeguards and independent oversight will prevent unauthorized access or misuse?
- What legal protections will residents have if their information is improperly accessed or shared?

Public safety should not come at the expense of personal privacy without clearly defined safeguards, accountability, and transparency.

2. **Financial Responsibility and Taxpayer Impact**

Watertown is already facing substantial financial obligations, borrowing costs, infrastructure needs, and long-term liabilities. Every additional expenditure should be carefully evaluated and justified.

I expect the Town to publicly disclose the complete financial obligations associated with these systems, including initial installation costs, annual subscription fees, maintenance, software upgrades, administrative expenses, and contractual commitments.

I also question whether alternative public safety investments have been evaluated and whether these camera systems represent an appropriate use of limited taxpayer resources.

Residents deserve a full financial analysis before the Town commits to another ongoing expense.

3. **Automated Speed Enforcement and Revenue Generation**

I fully support efforts to address dangerous driving, particularly near schools and in residential neighborhoods. However, automated enforcement should not automatically become the preferred solution without documented evidence demonstrating its necessity.

Has the Town evaluated increased police enforcement, traffic-calming measures, improved signage, roadway design, and other alternatives?

More importantly, what safeguards will ensure these systems are implemented strictly for public safety rather than becoming another source of municipal revenue?

The Town should establish measurable safety objectives and demonstrate how automated enforcement would improve conditions beyond what existing alternatives could accomplish.

4. **Transparency and Meaningful Public Participation**

Before either proposal advances, residents should have access to the following information:

- Proposed contracts and complete financial commitments.
- Proposed camera locations and the criteria used to select them.
- Data-retention and information-sharing policies.
- Documented public safety concerns supporting the installations.
- Independent oversight procedures and measurable performance objectives.

I also request that the Town schedule an **evening public meeting** so working residents have a reasonable opportunity to participate.

A public meeting should be an opportunity for genuine community input, not simply a procedural step before a decision that may already be taking shape.

5. **Long-Term Accountability and Oversight**

If these systems are ultimately approved, who will be responsible for independently evaluating their effectiveness, financial impact, privacy protections, and compliance with applicable laws?

Will the Council establish specific performance standards, require annual public reporting, and retain the authority to terminate the programs if they fail to meet their stated objectives?

Without clearly defined oversight and accountability, residents have little assurance that these programs will remain limited to their original purpose.

My Position

I support the Watertown Police Department and appreciate the work our officers perform every day. However, supporting law enforcement does not mean automatically supporting every surveillance or automated enforcement technology presented to the Town.

There is a significant difference between investing in public safety and expanding government monitoring of residents without first establishing necessity, transparency, financial justification, and meaningful safeguards.

I am requesting that no recommendation, contract, or financial commitment move forward until these questions have been answered publicly and residents have been given a reasonable opportunity to participate.

I also expect the Council and subcommittee to recognize that public participation is not limited to those who can physically attend a meeting. Written correspondence deserves consideration and a response, particularly when it raises specific questions involving public expenditures and individual privacy.

Residents should not have to choose between earning a living and having a voice in how their government spends their money or monitors their movements.

Please confirm receipt of this correspondence, that it will be distributed to all subcommittee members and the Town Council, and whether it will be included in the official public record. I would also appreciate written responses to the questions raised before either proposal advances.

Thank you for your attention to these concerns.

Best regards,

Barbara Zulkeski
Watertown Resident and Taxpayer

Lisa Cattaneo

From: Carina <carina.noyd@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2026 9:49 PM
To: Lisa Cattaneo
Subject: Fwd: Opposition to Speed Camera Adoption

Hi Lisa,

There was one more email. I apologize that I hadn't noticed it prior to this evening's meeting, as it came to my personal email rather than Council email. If you can please include it with the meeting minutes.

Thank you for all that you do,
Carina

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Richard Rozanski** <rrozansk@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Oct 20, 2026 at 4:05 PM
Subject: Opposition to Speed Camera Adoption
To: Carina <carina.noyd@gmail.com>, <desena@watertownct.org>, <demirs@watertownct.org>, <dematteis@watertownct.org>

Dear Committee Members,

I am unable to attend tonight's meeting and would like to express my opposition to the adoption of speed cameras in Watertown. While the reported revenue may seem intoxicating, residents of towns that have adopted them seem generally displeased with their adoption. Motorists by nature choose alternative routes of travel, resulting in unintended consequences, such as new routes of travel through previously quiet neighborhoods. In Prospect, local merchants are organizing to oppose the cameras as they have noticeably impacted their sales due to rerouted traffic patterns.

Should you choose to adopt these cameras, they should not trigger at any speed less than 10 mph over the posted limit.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Richard Rozanski
35 Reynolds St, Watertown, CT 06795
203-217-8424