

**TOWN OF WINDSOR, CONNECTICUT
Special Meeting Notice**



Zoom instructions

Dialing in by Phone Only:

Please call: **309 205 3325 or 312 626 6799**

When prompted for participant or meeting ID enter: **875 8408 6552** press #

1. You will then enter the meeting muted. During Public Comment if you wish to speak press *9 to raise your hand.

Joining in by Computer:

Please go to the following link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87584086552>

When prompted for participant or meeting ID enter: **875 8408 6552**

1. Only if your computer has a microphone for two way communication, then during Public Comment if you wish to speak press **Raise Hand** in the webinar control. If you do not have a microphone, you will need to call in on a phone in order to speak.
2. During Public Comments if you do not wish to speak you may type your comments into the Q&A feature.

AGENCY: Health & Safety Committee

DATE: September 15, 2025

TIME: 6:00 PM

PLACE: Hybrid - Virtual and In Person in Council Chambers at Town Hall

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. *Discussion on Automated License Plate Readers
4. Staff Reports
5. Approval of Minutes
 - a) *June 17, 2025
6. Adjournment

*Back up materials

Agenda Item Summary

Date: September 15, 2025

To: Members of the Health & Safety Committee

Prepared By: Donald Melanson, Chief of Police
Scott Colby, Assistant Town Manager
Peter Souza, Town Manager 

Subject: License Plate Reader Technology

Background

Earlier this summer the Health and Safety Committee had a preliminary discussion on the use of automated license plate reader (LPR) technology after hearing public comment concerning out of state law enforcement agencies accessing license plate data collected through LPR devices in Windsor. This memorandum will help frame a discussion on the use of LPR technology, how they help communities prevent and investigate crime, and various policy considerations or questions.

A License Plate Reader is a camera system that captures license plate numbers and related data (time, date, and location) as vehicles pass by. LPR networks allow law enforcement agencies to share license plate data across jurisdictions, which is critical in a time when criminal activity doesn't respect city or state boundaries. Law enforcement utilizes them to help recover stolen vehicles, locate missing persons, solve crimes, and support public safety investigations. They are not used to track people's day-to-day movements without cause. The LPR cameras in Windsor are not 'red light' cameras nor are they used for speed enforcement. They do not capture occupant photos or information. This technology has been in existence for several decades and is now common throughout the United States, helping law enforcement enhance public safety.

By way of background, in early spring 2012 discussions were held with the Council's Health and Safety Committee about mobile LPR technology, its use and data management. Later in 2012 through a partnership with a consortium of local police departments, a shared LPR equipped cruiser was purchased, with Windsor leading coordination for maintenance and usage across the region.

In 2019 the Police Department received grant funding to install LPR units on two town-owned patrol vehicles. Similar to the devices placed in service several years prior, they scan passing vehicles and alert officers when a license plate matches a record on the CT State Police-maintained database. The Health & Safety Committee discussed this grant and the use of the technology in the summer of 2019. Public education via social media and the town website were launched prior to placing the devices in service.

Starting in the summer of 2022, the Police Department began utilizing fixed LPR cameras. The LPR cameras are installed on public rights-of-way near major intersections and roadways that lead in and out of town, and other strategic points where vehicle traffic is high. Camera locations were determined using Police Department incident data along with input from our detective division. The department has 16 fixed LPR cameras.

Discussion / Analysis

The fixed LPR units are motion activated and take a still image of passing vehicles. The images are of the rear of a vehicle (after a vehicle passes the camera) and do not capture occupant descriptions. The LPR cameras are not staffed. The system is able to alert officers and dispatchers for various reasons. For example, if a stolen vehicle or suspect vehicle license plate is entered into a region wide crime database and that license plate is detected by an LPR in town, an electronic alert is issued. This allows for real time information to be followed up by our officers and detectives. Authorized law enforcement personnel can search the system only when there is a legitimate investigative reason and each search is recorded for accountability.

Collected data is retained for a limited period (30 days) unless linked to an active investigation. Searches are logged, and unauthorized use is prohibited. As noted above, the system does not capture photographs or personal information about drivers or passengers.

When Windsor first initiated the use of the Flock LPR devices, a setting labeled "Enable Nationwide Lookup" was enabled. This allowed WPD personnel to search nationwide if their case necessitated a wider search than just the State of Connecticut. Until recently, we were unaware that this setting, in return, allowed other agencies not granted individual access to WPD data to search the data if a full registration plate was entered. Since that realization, the Police Department has removed out of state access to our LPR data while the Town Council reviews various policy considerations. To reiterate - only agencies in Connecticut currently have the ability to search our LPR data without requesting specific permission from WPD administration.

The stationary LPR units offer 24/7 monitoring and have been a valuable tool for the Windsor Police Department by enhancing investigative capabilities and strengthening overall community safety. They have been vital in investigating violent crimes, property crimes including stolen vehicles and vehicle burglaries, evading accidents, and locating missing persons.

The LPR system gives investigators information that would otherwise rely on chance or witness memory. For example, if a car is used in a robbery, many times the victim and witnesses are only able to provide cursory vehicle information, such as the make, color and style of the vehicle. The LPR system can help officers identify the suspect vehicle and where and when it was last seen, giving police a direction to focus on. This can turn a dead-end investigation into an actionable lead. Please see the attached summary for a sample of how LPRs have assisted our patrol officers and detectives.

As has been voiced, there are understandable questions and concerns as to how and by whom LPR data can be accessed and utilized by non-Windsor law enforcement agencies. Primary policy questions for the Health and Safety Committee's consideration include among others:

- Is the LPR technology and data sharing network a key public safety tool for Windsor?
- Should Windsor data be shared with law enforcement agencies outside of Connecticut?
- If Windsor data is to be shared with non-Connecticut agencies, should it be geographically limited? (e.g. just to New England and the tri-state region, or agencies within 100 miles of Windsor.)

Financial Impact

Each camera is \$3,000 per year, including installation, software, and maintenance. Windsor has 16 Flock cameras installed throughout town for a total annual cost of \$48,000. A combination of General Fund dollars (\$18,000) and non-tax dollars (\$30,000) are used to pay the annual lease fee.

Other Board Action

None

Recommendations

It is recommended the Health and Safety Committee hear public comment regarding the use of LPR technology and data access and consider various policy questions including those outlined above in order to provide guidance to the Town Council on this matter.

Attachments

License Plate Reader FAQ Sheet -

<https://townofwindsorct.com/app/uploads/sites/19/2025/09/9.4.25-Flock-Safety-License-Plate-Reader-FAQ-PDF.pdf>

Sample Incidents Utilizing LPR

Flock Safety License Plate Reader Success Stories

The LPRs have been a valuable tool for the Windsor Police Department by enhancing investigative capabilities and strengthening overall community safety. They have been vital in solving violent crime, property crime including stolen vehicles and vehicle burglaries, evading accidents, and missing persons. Below is a small set of examples of how our Police Officers and Detectives have utilized LPRs to solve and prevent crime:

Date: March 12, 2023

Type of Call: Firearm / Shots Fired

Summary: Officers responded to 51 Meadow Road for a shots-fired complaint involving two sedans chasing each other. Two 9mm shell casings were located in the roadway. Reviewing Flock camera footage at I-91 and Windsor Avenue, officers identified two vehicles involved: a Mercedes-Benz and an Infiniti.

Date: June 23, 2023

Type of Call: Evading Motor Vehicle Accident

Summary: A passerby reported damage near the Eagle Green in the center of town. Officers were able to use security video from nearby property to identify a one vehicle accident that occurred at 2:37 am. Officers were able to identify the vehicle using the LPR camera and track down the evading vehicle, which led to the offender's arrest.

Date: June 23, 2023

Type of Call: Larceny

Summary: Police received a complaint of an attempted theft from a motor vehicle. The suspect vehicle was later confirmed to be stolen. A Flock LPR alert indicated the vehicle was traveling in Windsor toward Hartford. Officers were deployed to the area and successfully apprehended three suspects without incident.

Date: November 20, 2023

Type of Call: Street Takeover/Evading

Summary: A group of 80-100 cars had taken over a parking lot at Blue Hills/ Day Hill Road and were racing. When the officer arrived, the vehicles fled the scene, with one vehicle hitting a parked car while fleeing. The vehicle eluded the officer when he tried to stop him. Using LPR located on Day Hill Road, the officer was able to identify the vehicle and ultimately arrested the owner for evading the accident.

Date: July 29, 2024

Type of Call: Motor Vehicle Stop / Stolen Motor Vehicle Recovered

Summary: A Flock alert identified a stolen vehicle that was later observed turning onto Skitchewaug Street. Knowing it was a small neighborhood, officers canvassed the area and located the vehicle in a driveway on East Barber Street. While on scene, another vehicle approached. Using Flock, detectives were able to identify its marker plate. The case remains open/inactive pending CODIS results.

Date: July 30, 2024

Type of Call: Aggravated Assault

Summary: A male victim with a gunshot wound to the leg was located in front of CVS on Windsor Avenue. The incident was determined to have occurred near 160 Windsor Avenue. By reviewing the Windsor Avenue/I-91 LPR camera, officers identified a suspect vehicle. The suspect was later interviewed and arrested.

Date: December 2, 2024

Type of Call: Evading Motor Vehicle Accident

Summary: Officers responded to a motor vehicle accident at Route 218 and Matianuck Avenue. The at-fault operator fled prior to police arrival. During the investigation, officers obtained the registration plate of the evading vehicle. Using Flock, officers confirmed the vehicle had been traveling on Route 218 at the time of the accident. This information was later used as a lead to secure a confession from the operator.

Date: March 17, 2025

Type of Call: Burglary

Summary: Officers investigated a series of commercial burglaries at 10 Targeting Centre, a vacant commercial building. The series of burglaries resulted in approximately \$880,000 worth of stolen copper piping and electrical wiring. Flock cameras helped identify a U-Haul van involved in the burglaries. This led to a search warrant being executed on the van and the subsequent arrest of multiple suspects.

Date: June 10, 2025

Type of Call: Police Information / Stolen Motor Vehicle Recovered

Summary: A Flock camera on Kennedy Road alerted officers to a stolen vehicle. The vehicle was located in the Target parking lot. As it fled southbound on I-91, an officer successfully deployed stop sticks. The vehicle was stopped in Hartford, and the suspect was arrested on multiple charges.

Date: August 31, 2025

Type of Call: Missing Person

Summary: Officers responded to Gloria Street for a missing person complaint. The complainant reported that her son had not returned home from work and was not answering calls. A Flock alert indicated that the missing person's vehicle was in Windsor. Officers used this information to safely locate the individual.





**TOWN OF WINDSOR
HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE
SPECIAL MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
JUNE 17, 2025
HYBRID MEETING**

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER

Councilor Mary Armstrong, Chair of the Health & Safety Committee, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. with Deputy Mayor Darleen Klase and Councilor Lenworth Walker present.

Staff Present: Peter Souza, Town Manager; Scott Colby, Assistant Town Manager; Donald Melanson, Police Chief, and Jennifer Waldo, Public Nurse

2. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

3. OVERVIEW OF COMMUNITY HEALTH NEEDS ASSESSMENT REPORT

Mike Pepe, Director of Health and Jennifer Waldo, Public Nurse, introduced the consultants Kristen Dow and Luci Matthews from BerryDunn, which helped with the questionnaire and all the associated materials to get us where we are today.

Luci Matthews from BerryDunn gave a high-level overview and stated the CHNA community survey was launched using an online community engagement platform. The survey was open for one month and was promoted through social media, community partners and the town's website. While the survey was primarily conducted on-line, printed surveys were available at select locations at Town Hall, both libraries, LP Wilson Community Center and 330 Windsor Avenue Community Center.

Through the CHNA process, the Health Department collected responses from 376 Windsor residents and engaged with approximately 14 organizational partners to obtain input and develop priority area and high-level goals for the CHNA. The survey respondents were largely women over the age of 55.

Several key report findings include:

- Hartford County's ratio of mental health providers per population is better than all other CT counties
- County's ratio of primary care providers per population was lower than the rest of the State and the country
- Depression and frequent mental distress is estimated to be higher in Windsor compared to State overall

- 46% of respondents indicated cost to be main barrier to accessing mental health services and support
- Over 50% of respondents were not satisfied with their access to health care
- Social isolation / loneliness cited as top contributor to poor mental health by survey respondents
- Nearly 50% of respondents do not exercise for at least 150 minutes per week
- 36% of respondents indicated nutrition and exercise programs are a primary healthcare need in their household
- Many respondents indicated their weight and/or lack of time or space exercise was a concern or factor in their level of health.

Councilor Armstrong stated that out of the 376 residents surveyed, most of them were women over 55. Ms. Matthews said that is correct.

Councilor Armstrong said the chronic illnesses that were prevalent were high blood pressure, high cholesterol, and obesity, correct? Ms. Matthews said that was correct.

Councilor Armstrong said she also noticed that arthritis and depression levels were very high for those individuals. The three items that were prevalent for adults 18 years and older were social isolation, lack of social activities and emotional support was also noted. That was a high level for those that were 18 and older. Not even the 55 plus. Some of them were 35 years old and 45 years old. Is that correct? Ms. Matthews said yes.

Councilor Armstrong stated she saw that there was a low number that had primary care providers. Ms. Dow stated one interesting point about that overall is that there was a low number of individuals who identified having a primary care provider but there is a 98% insured rate in the Town of Windsor.

Deputy Mayor Klase said she was wondering if it's possible because we have a walk-in clinic in Windsor which she thinks people use heavily versus a primary care. She's wondering if our access to other types of preventative primary care might be what is being shown. Ms. Matthews said that's possible. She doesn't know that we have it on one of these slides, but there also was a question around satisfaction with access to care in the community. She thinks that was around 50% as well.

Eric Weiner, 72 Palisado Avenue said where you state the top four serious issues were related to economic finance and finance, is that as it relates to access to healthcare or overall say family finances? Ms. Matthews said these were the overall household issues. Those top four were cost of living, financial security, income and wages and debt.

Ms. Dow gave more of an update on the survey and stated what resources they used and the weaknesses and potential threats that were identified.

In collaboration with the Windsor Mental Health Alliance the following priority and goal areas were identified:

1. Mental Health Services - The prevalence of depression and frequent mental distress is estimated to be higher in Windsor than across the State of Connecticut overall, with over a quarter of Windsor residents estimated to be socially isolated and/or lacking necessary social, emotional and mental health supports.

Some of goals to work towards include:

- Goal #1 – increase awareness of mental health resources, including 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline and Minds Matter.
- Goal #2 – strengthen partnerships and improve connections to mental healthcare and support
- Goal #3 – offer programming to facilitate social connections and educational opportunities

Councilor Armstrong noted that the Health Department had a workshop or presentation on suicide. It wasn't well attended, but it was done. She also noted that people preferred virtual more than in person meetings. The age group was 25-34 which was really amazing with the 80% and even the age group of 19-24. So, if we could reach those age groups, it would be beneficial.

2. Physical Wellness - Results of the CHNA Community Survey highlight that factors, including not being at a healthy weight, a disease or illness and the ability to exercise, are among the top barriers to respondents' success being as healthy as possible.

Ms. Dow said data has shown that sleep deprivation was definitely prevalent among residents of the Town of Windsor with them getting less than seven hours of sleep which definitely has health impacts both for the physical health but also for the mental health.

Ms. Dow added that chronic diseases including high blood pressure, high cholesterol and obesity were all estimated to be about 30% among Windsor residents.

Councilor Armstrong said she noted there was an overweight and underweight factor that they were concerned about. She added that 55% of individuals were not aware of 988.

Some of the goals to work towards include:

- Goal #1 – increase awareness of existing community programming.
- Goal #2 – develop programs to address gaps in physical activity, nutrition, and wellness to help prevent and manage chronic disease.

3. Access to Care - As of 2021, the ratio of primary care providers per population in Hartford County was notably lower than both the State of Connecticut and the national average, indicating a shortage of providers in the region.

Some of the goals to work towards include:

- Goal #1 – partner with providers to promote and expand services
- Goal #2 – increase availability and ease of access to substance use disorder resources

Councilor Armstrong thanked the consultants for the extensive survey as it was well prepared and well done.

Town Manager Souza asked Dr. Pepe and Ms. Waldo if they had anything additional to add. Ms. Waldo said they'll be working with the Windsor Mental Health Alliance and they are recruiting new members to do that. They plan to meet quarterly and then work with them to help offer some guidance in terms of the programming based on a needs assessment, provide some insight in terms of their respective groups that they represent and to support and promote the priorities that were identified. Dr. Pepe added that they are also looking forward to working with various town departments to get their input and their help with some programming to better affect the challenges that we have.

4. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF SPEED ENFORCEMENT CAMERAS (INCLUDING PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY ON THIS PROJECT)

Town Manager Souza gave an overview of what has happened to date to get them to this point.

Scott Colby, Assistant Town Manager, (Don Melanson?) stated Public Act 23-116 (PA-116) implements the recommendations of the Vision Zero Council, an interagency work group dedicated to eliminating transportation-related injuries and fatalities throughout Connecticut with automated traffic enforcement safety devices.

These devices or cameras detect and collect evidence of alleged driving violations. The images captured by these devices include license plate information and the date, time, and location of alleged violations related to 1) speeding of 10 miles-per-hour or more over the posted limit and 2) failure to stop at a steady red light.

Municipalities need to follow the provisions set forth by PA-116 in order to receive approval to install and activate automated traffic enforcement safety devices. Primary requirements include adoption of an ordinance authorizing the use of these cameras and submission of a plan to CT DOT. Additionally, interested municipalities must adopt a citation hearing procedure, comprehensive safety action plan, and written privacy policy/protocol. Prior to submitting a plan to CT DOT, the municipality must conduct a public hearing and the municipal legislative body must vote on the proposal.

An ordinance needs to include the following:

- A requirement that the cameras be operated by a certified ATESD operator,

- assertion that the owner of a motor vehicle commits a violation of the ordinance should they travel 10 or more miles above the speed limit and/or fail to stop at a steady red light,
- cameras be used only to identify violations of the ordinance,
- written warnings only will be issued for the first 30 days after the device is put into service,
- payment of fines may be made electronically,
- recorded images will be reviewed by an authorized authority prior to the issuance of a violation.

Ordinances may also include information pertaining to the cost of fines for ordinance violation and fees for the processing of electronic payment. Fines for violations cannot be more than \$50 for the first violation and no more than \$75 for subsequent violations. Fine payments received need to be utilized for improving transportation mobility, investing in transportation infrastructure, or paying the costs associated with the use of the cameras, such as staff and maintenance. Additionally, a fee of no more than \$15 may be assessed to cover the cost of electronic payment processing and/or any administrative costs associated with the violation.

Along with adoption of an ordinance, municipalities are also required to create a comprehensive safety action plan which would be required three years after the first camera(s) become operational. Such a plan describes how a municipality will ensure that their streets can accommodate users of all ages, abilities, and modalities. Similar to a Vision Zero or complete streets plan, a comprehensive safety action plan can identify a variety of municipal traffic safety issues while presenting an array of methods to improve road safety concerns.

Municipalities need to create and submit a plan regarding the placement of cameras to the CT DOT prior to the use of such devices. CT DOT will review the plans and approve or deny them (in part or in whole) within 60 days. Primary considerations include the likelihood of camera placement to improve traffic safety in the area and equitable distribution of cameras throughout the municipality. Municipalities need to consider the following factors in formulation of a camera plan:

- history of traffic crashes caused by excessive speeding and/or traffic signal/sign violations at such location
- history of traffic crashes that resulted in fatality or serious injury at such location
- average daily traffic at such location
- history of traffic stops conducted
- roadway alignment of any such location

Further, municipalities must complete a number of actions subsequent to the plan approval by the CT DOT but prior to camera activation. These actions include the following:

- Installation of at least two signs for each approach along the roadway leading to the device,

- creation and implementation of a public awareness campaign regarding speed limits, traffic control signals, and the new cameras,
- training of an ATESD safety device operator,
- notification of the camera location to navigational mobile application operators.

By the end of 2025, CT DOT will issue guidance to municipalities regarding evaluation requirements for the effectiveness of activated devices and submission of subsequent camera plans.

Previously committee members asked questions regarding how CT Department of Motor Vehicles (CT DMV) is involved. Fines will be a violation of a municipality's ordinance, which means no points will be deducted from someone's license. Warnings or citations are not reported to the CT DMV.

Staff from the Engineering Department and Police Department have evaluated data to determine where these cameras could be placed. The following parameters were used in the evaluation:

- 85th Percentile Speed 10 MPH over the posted speed limit
- Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volumes of 3,500 or greater
- Motor vehicle stops related to speed
- Location of motor vehicle accidents

Utilizing the above parameters four locations were identified to be considered for Traffic Camera installation:

1. Poquonock Avenue (Route 75) between the I-91 South off-ramp and Farmstead Lane
2. Broad Street between Island Road and Remington Road
3. Windsor Avenue between Deerfield Road and Windsor Shopping Center
4. Rainbow Road between East Granby Road and Merriman Road

At this time, we are not recommending the use of cameras for 'red light' violations as we have a relatively small number of traffic stops and accidents related to signal violations.

A citizen asked if the speeding cameras would only be for speeding violations and not for the red light violations. Scott Colby, Assistant Town Manager, stated based on the data that we have there have been a very limited amount of accidents or speeding infractions of an individual traveling through a traffic signal. So, the data would not warrant that.

A citizen asked if you decide to have more than four locations in the future, that means a whole new application, or can you add, revise and switch up your locations? Assistant Town Manager Colby said that if the municipality were to implement and add on additional cameras or remove any cameras, they have the ability to do that if the plan is approved. If you're looking to add new cameras, a new application would be required through the CT DOT for approval.

A citizen asked why we didn't do something like that for Matianuck Avenue or other long stretches of road. Assistant Town Manager Colby said based upon the data we had collected, we were looking at those parameters that we had selected in regards to the speed, the traffic motor vehicle stops and accidents. We had identified those as the top four locations for these proposed cameras at this point in time.

A citizen asked what was the impetus for this program? What was the reason for it? Assistant Town Manager Colby responded that the State of Connecticut started to look at, as a part of their Vision Zero Safety Plan, a variety of different approaches to enhance pedestrian safety and safety among the roadways. Police Chief Melanson said speeding is probably one of the top three complaints that the Police Department receives as an organization. There has been heavy emphasis over the years on traffic safety and how to be able to try to slow down motor vehicles. There was essentially bringing that overall goal of traffic safety, pedestrian safety, and bicycle safety and to explore this potential tool to apply it here in Windsor.

A citizen asked if there is any data at this point from other towns that have implemented these on either how much of a reduction in speeding there is or revenue it has produced? Assistant Town Manager Colby said there are three municipalities that have their approval from the Department of Transportation. He believes two of them have their cameras in operation currently. They've only been in operation for roughly a month.

Assistant Town Manager Colby said a number of states have had this on the book for several years. A fair amount of the cameras are located within the school zones. If we look at data from mid-Atlantic states, there is indication that they have reduced speeds. There are other reports and some towns and cities, larger jurisdictions, have chosen to back away from using these cameras for a range of reasons. Town Manager Souza added that some have concerns with disparate impacts amongst different communities. Some folks are saying this is a 'money grab'. There are parameters in which those funds could be used. You can't just go to the general fund and use that money.

Eric Weiner, 72 Palisado Avenue, stated a municipality that neighbored where he used to live in California wound up having a terrible experience with using third parties to do the billing and they had to fire them because they found a lot of fraud happening. It just became a disaster on their first implementation. This is ten plus years ago. He gave an example of using a third party for billing. Mr. Weiner gave the committee a handout. He spoke about the handout stating we already collect license plate data in Windsor. Very few people in town are aware that we have about 16 cameras that are recording every license that goes by on these particular locations and it's uploaded to a service run by a company named Flock. He was very curious when this discussion came up on how much data is being collected. So, he did an FOIA request. The Chief of Police processed that right away and one of his staff members got back to me practically before he hit the "Return" button on the request. Between April 1st and June 9th, there were about 600,000 requests/lookups of Windsor's specific data from agencies across the country. The preliminary analysis he did showed hundreds of immigration-related searches of

Windsor's data. He went on to explain what other states have done and continued with examples of what others have done regarding the data and how it has expanded to other agencies getting involved. He believes that the Town Council owes it to the residents of Windsor to broaden the issue and come up with a policy of how we want to view Windsor's data before we consider going on and expanding to recording yet more data about individual movements of people in town. We don't have to do it. He expressed his discontent in others being able to see this data and in how they can manipulate it. The only way we can have control over our data and our civil liberties is to choose whether to collect it or not. Once it goes to a third party, we've lost control. He believes the Town Council owes it to the residents here to get input and decide on that possibility. But decide on that policy before we move further.

A citizen stated we've explored a lot of traffic calming measures in the center of town. He thinks punishment is a last resort for the traffic calming. He thinks there's a lot of alternatives. If the goal is to slow traffic, these cameras are probably the last thing we should be looking at. We're spending a lot of effort downtown and throughout town to find ways to reduce speeds through physical restructuring of the roadways. These types of activities, punishment style activities, to reduce traffic speeds aren't as effective as typical traffic common devices. It just seems like this is the right approach for the technology we have available to us and some of the more relevant data we have that we had years ago when the roads were originally designed.

A citizen asked that the Police Chief to tell them who has access now to the data that's collected from the Flock cameras that are currently out there. Police Chief Melanson stated there's 16 license plate reader cameras throughout town. When an officer is investigating a case, or responding to a case, some of the recent ones we've had were recovered. We recovered a stolen car that was in town. We had a person that hit a bicyclist in the center of town and evaded the scene. So, the police officer, once they get the description of the vehicle, they can put that in the system with the license plate (if they get a partial license plate number) and they can search whatever they are looking for. They can search our cameras only if they believe the car may have gone to a different jurisdiction. You can expand that to search neighboring towns as well. It'll identify if that car was hit. You can also set the time period of how far back you want to go. As Mr. Weiner mentioned, it keeps data for 30 days. Any time an officer does do a search, it's logged and it's recorded, and the officer has to put a rational reason for that.

A citizen asked if this is a national system? Police Chief Melanson stated that Flock is a national company and there are thousands of law enforcement agencies that share data amongst there. So, for law enforcement agencies doing it, they would be able to access that data as well to see if they're following up. The citizen added that it sounds so good on paper, but in this environment that we're living in, then it gets scary. Police Chief Melanson said one of the things that they're doing is they look at the data and our officers. We are able to look and see who's looking at our data and what they're doing with it. One of the things too is we monitor our officers on what they're searching for, so we can look and see and make sure that they're following our policy. We do have a policy that's

required. Just like any law enforcement sensitive data, the officers need a reason to look at it. So, it's the same thing with looking up someone's driver's license or registration on a vehicle. If an officer needs to have a nexus to look at that, they just can't go do that. If they, do it improperly, it's a crime. It's actually a felony to access a database without the proper authorization.

A citizen asked if you can control that? Police Chief Melanson said yes and they've done that. They've looked at officers and dispatchers to see if any of the searches have been improper when they have that type of information. So, it is monitored. Again, we control ours and Flock will only share it with law enforcement. There are other vendors that have license plate readers such as tow truck drivers that do repossessions. They all have license plate reading cameras on their tow trucks and they drive around. Many of the other vendors share that data with tow truck operators and the tow truck operators are driving around scanning plates so they may be driving up and down your street and they're capturing your data. So that technology is actually out there. The reason why Flock is the predominant vendor of choice for law enforcement is that they're the ones that have the tightest controls on it, and only share that data amongst law enforcement. They will not share or sell the data to other organizations.

A citizen asked about the parameters used to do the evaluation. She said you also keep information about the order in which the highest number say for example the motor vehicles accidents within those parameters. Assistant Town Manager Colby replied are you asking if they were all at the very top for each of those categories? So, for the four proposed locations that we've identified, he would say they definitely hit on the top tier of 3 out of 4 of the parameters for each of those. While the Department of Transportation is really only focused on average daily traffic count motor vehicle stops as well as motor vehicle accidents, we, as a municipality, proposed to include a parameter in regards to speed, to help justify some of those proposed locations as well.

A citizen asked how many accidents are there? Do we have that number? Police Chief Melanson said that they did look at a 5 year period from 2019-2023. He believes there are over 3,000 accidents. The four locations we chose were in the top 10. The first one was Windsor Avenue. That was the top. That was 17% of the accidents. Poquonock Avenue was 9.8%, Broad Street was 86, which is almost 3% and Rainbow Road was a little over 1.5%. Those were all in the top 10. Route 218 was out there, but a lot of those accidents are caused because of traffic lights and speeding, but there are multiple factors. We try to see where the accidents are being caused.

Eric Weiner, 72 Palisado Avenue, said he has full confidence in Windsor's officers obeying rules, but he doesn't have confidence in other agencies across the country doing that to access our data. We have no control over that. That's the environment that we're in today unfortunately. We don't have to contribute to that if we choose not to. He asked on those census tracks that we don't match those selected, where is that? Are they excluded from putting the cameras in? Assistant Town Manager Colby responded that the DOT just

takes the information and evaluates it on a different level in regards to how many cameras could be placed within a qualified census track. So, you couldn't put four cameras in one qualified census track.

Deputy Mayor Klase asked if there was a way for Flock to only share the Windsor data with Windsor, CT police because we can monitor our police officers, but we can't monitor other state officers although they all should be under the same kind of rules, correct? You can't exclude yourself from that part of an agreement, can you? Police Chief Melanson said they do have the ability to limit who they share data with. Usually, it's a cooperative agreement. If we were to stop sharing, they wouldn't share data with us as well. Town Manager Souza added that hypothetically, we could say we're going to share it with Connecticut law enforcement agencies and say western Massachusetts or new England states. We do have the ability to do that.

Deputy Mayor Klase asked regarding the vendors, she believes there were three vendors that are approved for these cameras in Connecticut and they are all Connecticut vendors. Town Manager Souza said they're not necessarily based in Connecticut. Most of these are the 4 or 5 leading vendors that are out there that provide this technology in this service and they aren't necessarily headquartered here but they may have their presence here or they're trying to.

Deputy Mayor Klase asked then we can alter the data agreement with them as well? Town Manager Souza said they have not yet had any of those discussions but he imagines there's a level of negotiation we'd attempt to do if we were to go down that path.

A citizen said so these proposed new cameras would not also be monitored by Flock, it would be someone else? Assistant Town Manager Colby said he's not sure off the top of his head if Flock provides this level of service with cameras.

Deputy Mayor Klase asked if there is a cost outlay for us because she knows that it is done via a vendor correct? Do we know what the cost outlay has been for other towns? Town Manager Souza said you can do it two different ways. You can have a capital outlay cost and if we were to do four locations, it would be approximately a \$200,000 outlay. Assistant Town Manager Colby added that yes, if we were to purchase them outright it would be \$200,000, which does not include the cost to install and wire those cameras. Town Manager Souza added that what we've outlined in past agenda item summaries is that would be a on a monthly lease/subscription type of service, and he believes that is about half the cost. That's the cost that's allowed to be recovered through or paid back through any fine revenue that is received.

Deputy Mayor Klase asked if an officer and vendor can review the films as well? Assistant Town Manager Colby said to review the violations he believes under state law it's the police officer of the designee within that municipality that's been trained that can do that. Town Manager Souza added that with the way that we outlined it here was we factored in the cost of approximately \$70,000 and that would be for the appeal process and having

an independent hearing officer, retired attorney or a retired law enforcement person that would be on a very part-time basis. We also built in the possibility of having either overtime hours for police officer review to be able to determine if there indeed was an infraction or again a part-time individual that would be certified to determine if an infraction occurred.

Deputy Mayor Klase stated that the only reason they are even considering this is because the town has received numerous complaints about the speeding in town and there's not an ability to hire more officers. There's not the budget for that. So, we're trying to figure out what is the balance that needs to be done.

Councilor Walker stated that since he's been here, they've been getting multiple speeding complaints. These are some of the areas that the cameras are being placed or where most of the calls come from. Technology is evolving. We need to engage it and put as many restrictions as we possibly can to make the process fair. We should come up with a plan and submit it to the entire Council and see where we go from there. You said that registered owner of the vehicle is responsible? Assistant Town Manager Colby replied that is correct.

Councilor Armstrong said there are options which they have not yet discussed regarding cost factors. She knows Town Manager Souza outlined option one and option two. As far as optioning out for vendors and for outright purchasing the equipment, it is also included in that. Also included in that she did see that they would have to probably get someone to do this as an administrator. That would be \$70,000 that we are estimating and a \$12,000 fee would that be for the equipment monthly fee? Assistant Town Manager Colby said that is correct.

Councilor Armstrong said if we outright purchase this item, would that be cost effective other than getting a vendor to do this? Town Manager Souza stated the staff's recommendation is to have a third party vendor do this. This would cause a lot more administrative overhead if we were to try to do this ourselves. The third party is equipped to do that. Really the question would be do we want to do a capital outlay of approximately \$200,000 and based upon the research that we've done, that's not our recommendation. The recommendation would be to enter into a lease arrangement or annual maintenance agreement with a third party to provide basically a turnkey operation. Assistant Town Manager Colby added to lease those cameras for that \$100,000 that does not have a service charge or anything like that. That's all built into the leasing cost.

Councilor Armstrong asked about the \$15+ fee. Is that added into the violation that will be charged? Assistant Town Manager Colby stated that it would be added onto the \$50 or the \$75 fee or the violation fine. Under State law, they allowed municipalities to be able to have that administrative fee up to \$15. Councilor Armstrong then stated that you would be adding \$15 onto a \$50 fine which would really be \$65. Assistant Town Manager Colby said that is something that they'd have to work out with the vendors. It would be dependent upon if there's a credit card processing fee, or anything like that, as part of that individual having to pay their fine. Town Manager Souza added that would be part of

an evaluation negotiation with the third party. Per State law, that fee can be no more than \$15. Assistant Town Manager Colby said that was correct.

Councilor Armstrong said it was stated that the information can be kept for 30 days, correct? Assistant Town Manager Colby said that was correct.

Councilor Armstrong asked what happens if the ticket is not paid? Assistant Town Manager Colby stated if the ticket is not paid it goes into a regular collections process. That's certainly a question I would have to look into in regards to what happens to the data for nonpayment of a ticket. Police Chief Melanson added that he believes the data was that if it's in a process, it's 30 days or until the process is complete. So, if someone does not pay that ticket, we can keep that data until the ticket is paid, or it goes through the appeals process. Councilor Armstrong asked if there is an expiration on that? Police Chief Melanson said yes, as long they have an update that it's still open. Councilor Armstrong stated the benefit of that is that it is not reported to the DMV. Is that correct? Police Chief Melanson said that is correct. Councilor Armstrong asked so it's just held in our archives or in the police data until that ticket is paid? Is there a certain amount of accumulations or can they just continue to accumulate tickets? Assistant Town Manager Colby stated that was something that he'd have to look into as to what the maximum could be for an individual to continue to get tickets.

Town Manager Souza asked Police Chief Melanson if there is a State applicable law when there's a written infraction. Chief Melanson stated that when there is a written infraction and you fail to pay or plea, then you could actually be issued a warrant to appear for it, and then there would be additional court fees. He stated that it is similar to our parking ticket, which is a municipal violation which this would be the fines after. If they're not paid in a certain period of time, they double after that timeframe. He believes the state law allows that if it is not paid within a certain timeframe, it can be adjusted based on failure to pay.

Councilor Armstrong asked if the ticket is not paid and we maintain that will there be an additional fee or interest on any of the tickets? Chief Melanson answered and said that a lot of this is negotiable with the vendor that we choose, and because many times they're responsible for the collections, they are the ones that would issue out that fine to a collection agency. So, the collection agency would then do additional charges. Our fee will remain the same because the vendor that is reimbursing us use their avenues civilly to go after people. Councilor Armstrong also asked if there was any cost additionally to the vendors, if they have to do something like that? Chief Melanson answered not to his knowledge.

Deputy Mayor Klase asked if they wanted to send this information to the Town Council with some parameters? Councilor Armstrong asked what would those parameters be? Deputy Mayor Klase answered and said that they should have the town staff look into what we can do around the data policy for the existing Flock cameras. She stated that she is supportive of the lease concept. She believes that it is important to bring this to the

Council. They could have an ordinance and/or a Public Hearing regarding this matter and also the Council can weigh in on this. She suggested looking into other towns that have already implemented this. So, they can see what those towns have wrote for their ordinances or policies.

Town Manager Souza stated that he thinks it would be something along the line of does the committee want to recommend to the Town Council to go to the next step, which would be to direct the town staff to develop a draft ordinance and a plan for submittal for public and DOT to review. This would include looking at benchmark ordinances on the feasibility of it and looking at revising simultaneously, or first revising the data policy or privacy policy relative to the existing license plate reading program that could potentially be that direction that is recommended to the Town Council.

Councilor Walker asked what has West Hartford done with their camera system and how far have they gotten as far as written procedures? Town Manager Souza stated that from his understanding they have adopted an overall plan and they are approaching that stage for a Public Hearing as well as submittal to the State Department of Transportation for review of their plan. Town Manager Souza stated that they may have already done those things but that is basically where they are right now. They are only aware of three communities that have actually been approved. A small town of Washington, Middletown, and the town of Marlboro. There have been other towns that have submitted but those are the only three from our understanding that have been approval issued by DOT.

Councilor Walker stated that his reasoning for asking that is maybe the Council can look and see where they are and what they have written and also address some of the concern the residents may have. Town Manager Souza said absolutely, that would be part of what we would be looking at. We'd be looking at, not only the model ordinance or templates that the state is providing, but also looking at what the ordinances that have been already approved and signed off on their programs.

Councilor Armstrong stated that she is in agreeance with looking into these items and presenting them to the Council. Town Manager Souza stated that they might want to go back to the Council on July 7th with a recommendation to direct staff to move forward with developing a required draft ordinance. Deputy Mayor Klase asked can the full Council have a similar presentation like they had tonight? Town Manager Souza said yes, they could do that. He also stated that there is going to be fair amount of work that's remaining to be done. He thinks the committee has been very aware of that. The Council will at least have a consensus to move forward. It doesn't have to be a formal 9-0 vote, or a 5-4 vote. But at least it will be in that direction to say, let's do it and then it's going to take us at least through the summer to be able to develop and do additional research. They all agreed to bring it to the Council at the July meeting.

Town Manager Souza stated that he will make sure that it gets put on the Council's agenda. Deputy Mayor Klase stated that she will make sure that they all read the Health & Safety Committee report. Councilor Armstrong stated that they have listen to the

discussions of the audience and the public comments as well as what Chief Melanson has outlined. Town Manager Souza wanted to note that if one of the parameters is to look at us for existing license plate readers, the privacy data management policy we can certainly look at that. They will look at that and report back to the Council and they will be able to do that within the course of the next 30 days.

Deputy Mayor Klase stated that would be helpful to do because she knows that the Mayor has expressed concerns about ice as well as other concerns. So, it will be better to have that conversation sooner rather than later.

Councilor Armstrong added that maybe they should add whether Flock would be involved in any of that too as far as the vendor is concerned. Councilor Armstrong asked if there was already a committee for the Safety Action plan? Town Manager Souza stated that they've had for a good number of years now an internal staff committee that they refer to as the Traffic Committee, which is multidisciplinary as Public Works Department, the Police Department, Engineering Department, and the Town Manager's Office that also participates. They meet on a monthly basis to review data. We are doing that consistently during the non-winter months data collection. So, if a resident calls in and says, I have a concern about speeding on Mayflower, then we put that into the rotation, and we go and put up the counters and collect data to try to understand what's happening in that particular stretch of road and help inform residents. We put that together with our Drivewise program, the yellow signs that go on the lawns for awareness. That committee reviews traffic data as well as recent accidents that have happened and then also other concerns relative to traffic, pedestrian, safety, and bicycle safety. So, that is what the committee will be working on while putting together these plans.

Councilor Armstrong also stated that they have their webpage up that the resident can go on and look at it.

Councilor Armstrong asked if there was any other public comment and Eric Weiner, 72 Palisado Avenue, asked if they were going to speak about the sound camera options that was mentioned in one of the memos. Town Manager Souza stated that it hasn't been discussed at a staff level because some of significant challenge. He is only aware of one other community that's looking state law does allow to have used technology relative to this is for exhausts and that are exceeding certain standards, noise standards. I'm only aware of one community right now. It's exploring that the use of that technology as part of a local ordinance and enforcement. We have not approached that topic internally as of yet. Councilor Armstrong stated so that is why it is not on the agenda this evening. Councilor Armstrong thanked both the Town Manager, the Assistant Town Manager, and the Chief Police for their presentation.

5. STAFF REPORTS - None

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES



a) December 11, 2024 Special Meeting

MOVED by Deputy Mayor Klase, seconded by Councilor Walker to approve the unapproved minutes of the December 11, 2024 special meeting as presented.

Motion Passed 3-0-0

7. ADJOURNMENT

MOVED by Councilor Walker, seconded by Deputy Mayor Klase, to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

Motion Passed 3-0-0

Respectfully submitted by,

Helene M. Albert
Recording Secretary