

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES-WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 28, 2026

The council met on Wednesday, January 28, 2026, and called to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Town Hall, Council Chambers, Council Chairman Calouro presiding:

PRESENT: Council Chairman, Nathan Calouro
Vice-Chairwoman, Mary Parella
Councilman, Antonio "Tony" Teixeira
Councilman, Timothy Sweeney
Councilman, Aaron Ley

ALSO PRESENT: Town Administrator, Steven Contente
Town Solicitor, Andy Teitz, Esq
Town Sergeant, Archie Martins

Pledge of Allegiance

Council Chair Calouro led the Council and audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Prior to the commencement of the regular agenda, Chairman Calouro took a moment to acknowledge members of the Town staff for their excellent work and efforts in responding to and managing the recent snowstorm. He also congratulated the Patriots on making it into the Super Bowl.

Motion RE: Consent Agenda - To Approve the Consent Agenda

Sweeney/Teixeira- Voted unanimously to approve the Consent Agenda as prepared and presented.

A. Submission of Minutes of Previous Meeting(s)

A1. Town Council Meeting Minutes - January 7, 2026

Sweeney/Ley- Voted unanimously to approve these minutes as prepared and presented.

Prior to the vote being taken, Clerk Cordeiro noted two corrections to the presented Town Council draft minutes. The first correction clarified that the Town Sergeant was not in

attendance. The second correction corrected the spelling of a name in Agenda Item F1, changing "Camillo" to "John Comelo."

B. Public Hearings

C. Ordinances

- C1.** Ordinance 2026-01 Chapter 17, Article II Alcoholic Beverages Establishments, Section 17-82 - (to decrease the number of Class BV Liquor Licenses from 33 to 32)
(1st Reading)

Teixeira/Sweeney- Voted unanimously to consider this action to constitute the first reading of Ordinance #2026-01. Advertise in the local newspaper.

D. Licensing Board - New Petitions

- D1.** Philip Fitting, for Explore Bristol - Request for One-Day Dancing & Entertainment License on June 12, 2026, from 5:00 pm - 9:00 pm at Independence Park **(see also D2, D3)**

a. recommendation - Town Administrator and Police Chief

b. recommendation - Town Administrator and Fire Chief

c. recommendation - Town Administrator and Director of Parks and Recreation

Teixeira/Parella- Voted unanimously to grant this license per the recommendations received and conditions, if any, as delineated, and also subject to conformance to all laws and ordinances and payment of all fees, taxes, and levies

Prior to the vote being taken, Philip Fittings of Explore Bristol, speaking on behalf of British Motor Cars addressed the council. He described the annual British antique automobile show, now in its eighth year, which draws private collectors from across New England and as far as New Jersey. He outlined a two-part event: a pre-show on Friday, June 12, 2026, from 5:00 PM to 9:00 PM at Independence Park, featuring live music, beer, and approximately 60-70 British cars on display, followed by the

main show the next day at Colt State Park, expected to bring at least 250 cars and run roughly from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM. Fittings emphasized the event's strong track record, noting it has grown in popularity each year and has not generated any problems.

D2. Philip Fitting, for Explore Bristol - Request for Mobile Food Establishment Event Permit for British Cars in Bristol Event on June 12, 2026, from 5:00 pm - 9:00 pm at Independence Park **(see also D1, D3)**

a. recommendation - Town Administrator and Police Chief

b. recommendation - Town Administrator and Fire Chief

c. recommendation - Town Administrator and Director of Parks and Recreation

d. recommendation - Town Administrator and Director of Public Works

Sweeney/Teixeira- Voted unanimously to grant this license per the recommendations received and conditions, if any, as delineated, and also subject to conformance to all laws and ordinances and payment of all fees, taxes, and levies

D3. Philip Fitting, Explore Bristol, requests to sell/serve alcohol in support of British Motorcars in Bristol, at Independence Park on June 12, 2026, from 5:00 PM - 9:00 PM **(see also D1, D2)**

a. recommendation - Town Administrator and Chief of Police

b. recommendation - Town Administrator and Fire Chief

c. recommendation - Town Administrator and Director of Community Development

d. recommendation - Town Administrator and Director of Parks and Recreation

e. recommendation - Town Administrator and Director
Public Works

Sweeney/ Teixeira- Voted
unanimously to grant this license
per the recommendations received
and conditions, if any, as
delineated, and also subject to
conformance to all laws and
ordinances and payment of all
fees, taxes, and levies

E. Licensing Board - Renewals

E1. 3-Month Review for AZJ Aidan's d/b/a Aidan's Pub,
Michael Cockcroft, 5 John Street - Modification of
Dancing and Entertainment License for expansion of
premises (to include outdoor entertainment on
Fridays) **(continued from October 22nd)**

a. follow up/update from Bristol Police Department to
Jeff Quinlan (November 5, 2025)

b. recommendation - Town Administrator and Police
Chief

Teixeira/Sweeney-voted unanimously
allow the establishment to continue
with the licenses, based on the
recommendation subject to another six
(6) month review

Prior to the vote being taken, Councilman Teixeira, citing the
Police Department's recommendation, moved to approve the license
with a six-month review period rather than three months.

Chairman Calouro noted that the police report referenced
approximately ten incidents, roughly half of which were
determined to be non-issues, while several raised legitimate
concerns. He further explained that the Police Department had
not previously had the opportunity to weigh in on the outdoor
seating component of the license, and that a mid-year, six-month
review would allow the Town to monitor any potential issues.

E2. Kevin Amaral, Vigilant Brewing 44 Ballou Blvd.,
requests modifications to Dancing & Entertainment
License (adding additional days and hours)

- a. recommendation - Town Administrator and Chief of Police
- b. recommendation - Town Administrator and Fire Chief
- c. recommendation - Town Administrator and Director of Community Development

Sweeney/Teixeira- Voted unanimously to approve the modification of the Dancing and Entertainment License to allow the additional hours and to grant the license in accordance with the recommendations received and any conditions as delineated, subject to conformance with all applicable laws and ordinances and the payment of all required fees, taxes, and levies

Prior to the vote being taken, Councilman Teixeira asked for clarification regarding how late outdoor entertainment could run on various days of the week, expressing concern about the request to allow outdoor entertainment until 10:00 PM every day. Clerk Cordeiro clarified that the ordinance requires all outdoor entertainment to be concluded by 10:00 PM Sunday through Thursday and by 11:00 PM on Fridays and Saturdays, confirming that the request would remain within those limits.

Petitioner Kevin Ameral addressed the Council, explaining that the extended hours were intended primarily to accommodate private events on days when the brewery is not typically open and to support upcoming fundraising efforts with the Fourth of July Committee, including a "Queen of Hearts" fundraiser.

F. Petitions - Other

F1. Frank Fales, Carnival Chairman for the Fourth of July Sub Committee Request Use of Town Common for Carnival, June 19 - July 4, 2026, from 5:00-10:00 pm - (Complete shutdown of the carnival will be 10:30 pm) and July 4th from 12:00-6:00 pm. (Set-up dates will begin on June 15th with the removal date of July 5 & 6, 2026)

- a. recommendation - Town Administrator and Chief of Police
- b. recommendation - Town Administrator and Fire Chief

c. recommendation - Town Administrator and Director of Parks and Recreation

d. recommendation - Town Administrator and Department of Public Works

Teixeira/Sweeney- Voted unanimously to approve the use of the Town Common for the Fourth of July Carnival from June 19 through July 4, 2026, operating daily from 5:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., with complete shutdown by 10:30 p.m., and on July 4, 2026, from 12:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., including approval of set-up beginning June 15, 2026, and removal on July 5 and July 6, 2026, subject to compliance with all applicable laws, ordinances, and any conditions imposed by the Town.

F2. Marianne Bergenholtz, 366 Hope Street, Unit 1, requesting Council consideration to maintain the current number of BV liquor licenses (33) to allow for the application for restaurant -Bistro 205

Sweeney/ Teixeira - Voted unanimously to continue the matter to the February 11, 2026 council meeting to formally call for public hearing on March 18, 2026.

Prior to the vote being taken the Council then heard a request from Maryann and Tom Bergenholtz, 366 Hope Street, regarding liquor licensing for their planned restaurant, Bistro 205, to be located at 205 Thames Street. It was clarified that earlier in the meeting the Council had conducted a first reading of an ordinance to reduce the total number of BV liquor licenses from 33 to 32, and that the Bergenholtz request was effectively asking the Council not to proceed with that reduction so that a license would remain available for their proposed restaurant.

Maryann and Tom Bergenholtz addressed the council and described their plan to convert the vacant, leased building at 205 Thames Street into a family-run restaurant they characterized as "a little bit above average," while maintaining affordable pricing. They indicated the restaurant would employ approximately 18-20 people, including a full staff of chefs and front- and back-of-house employees. They stated that the restaurant is part of their lease agreement with the Town and

emphasized that obtaining a full BV liquor license, rather than a beer-and-wine-only license, was critical to the restaurant's financial viability.

Vice Chairwoman Parella asked who would own and operate the restaurant, and the Bergenholtz's confirmed it would be a family-run operation, with their youngest son handling much of the restaurant management.

A discussion ensued regarding process and timing, including requirements for a public hearing, abutters' notice, and advertising. Town Clerk Cordeiro explained that advertising for the ordinance change had already been initiated and that a combined ordinance adoption and liquor license public hearing could likely be scheduled for the March 11 Council meeting, following a call for public hearing at the February 11 meeting.

Council Chairman Calouro outlined the Council's longstanding practice of issuing a Limited BV (beer and wine only) license for an initial six-month period to new operators with no prior liquor-license history in Bristol, in order to ensure the establishment operates as a good neighbor before consideration of a full BV license. He noted that this approach has generally been effective in balancing business interests with neighborhood concerns and avoiding past issues.

Clerk Cordeiro and Town Solicitor Teitz further clarified that any liquor license could be granted subject to all required state and local approvals (including taxation, Secretary of State, Department of Health, and fire marshal clearances), and that the six-month period on any conditional license would begin when the license is actually issued and picked up, not on the date of the Council vote.

Mr. & Mrs. Bergenholtz expressed concern that a six-month limitation to beer and wine would pose a hardship during their first summer season. They cited their extensive business experience, including prior ownership of a company with hundreds of employees and over \$100 million in sales, as well as Maryann Bergenholtz's successful business operations in Worcester. They also stated that they have invested more than \$1 million in Town-owned buildings and emphasized their commitment to maintaining a positive relationship with the Town and surrounding neighborhood. They referenced prior licensing decisions as precedent; Vice Chairwoman Parella responded that in those instances the operators had an established local track record the Council could evaluate.

Vice Chairwoman Parella further explained that the Limited BV practice developed over time due to issues with prior establishments that transitioned from restaurants into bar-focused operations, including impacts related to late-night activity and college-age crowds. She emphasized that liquor licenses are not treated as a property right and that each applicant must be evaluated independently, even when applying for a license at a previously licensed location.

Councilman Ley noted that, based on the proposed concept and scale of Bistro 205, the establishment did not appear likely to create late-night issues, while also acknowledging the importance of consistency with past Council practice.

Nate Bergenholtz briefly addressed the Council, introducing himself and noting his 15 years of restaurant experience in multiple cities. He suggested a possible compromise whereby a full BV license could be granted with earlier closing hours for an initial six-month period to demonstrate responsible operation.

As discussion moved toward potential terms and conditions, Town Solicitor Teitz advised that the Council was entering substantive deliberation better reserved for the formal public hearing, where abutters and the public would have proper notice and an opportunity to comment. The discussion was then redirected to procedural matters.

Clerk Cordeiro confirmed that the next step would be a formal call for public hearing at the February 11 Council meeting, with the public hearing and second reading of the ordinance anticipated for March 11.

The Bergenholtz family acknowledged the process and agreed to proceed accordingly.

- F3.** Sara Castilloux, 9 Third School Street, requests existing Accessible parking spot be relocated for driveway accessibility
- a. recommendation - Town Administrator and Chief of Police
 - b. recommendation - Town Administrator and Director of Public Works

Teixeira/Parella- Voted unanimously to refer the matter to the Town

Administrator and Police Chief to meet with the parties, evaluate possible alternatives (including potential relocation of the accessible space), and return to the Council with a recommendation at a future meeting.

Prior to the vote being taken, Ms. Sara Castelloux and her co-resident/caretaker Kaitelin Castelloux also of 9 Third School Street, addressed the council and stated that the current location of the accessible parking space, combined with significant on-street parking congestion and multiple college residences on the block, creates difficulty and, at times, safety concerns when entering and exiting their driveway. They noted that this is particularly problematic for medical transportation, including ambulances and adult day-health transport serving Ms. Castelloux's disabled mother. They cited instances in which emergency vehicles were required to park several houses away and situations on trash collection days where refuse placement, in conjunction with the accessible space, further obstructed driveway access.

Ms. Sara Castelloux and Kaitelin Castelloux also explained that the accessible parking space was originally approved years earlier for Ms. Castelloux's grandfather, who is now deceased, and that the space is currently used primarily by a resident of 14 Third School Street who has a disabled child. They indicated that they are not seeking to eliminate the accessible space but rather requested that it be relocated closer to 14 Third School Street, which they believe would better serve that household while alleviating access issues at their own driveway.

Police Chief Lynch reported that, following a site visit, officers conducted a maneuverability assessment using two large SUVs to simulate exiting Ms. Castillo's driveway with a vehicle parked in the accessible space. (Video of the site visit was displayed for council review). Based on that assessment, officers were able to exit the driveway without difficulty, and the Police Department therefore recommended denial of the relocation request. Chief Lynch further confirmed that the accessible space is actively and appropriately used by the family residing at 14 Third School Street.

In response, Ms. Castelloux stated that the police demonstration reflected a vehicle parked fully within the marked space, whereas the vehicle typically using the space frequently extends beyond the designated lines, encroaching on their driveway. They also noted an ongoing personal dispute with the neighboring

resident, which they indicated is being addressed separately with the Police Department.

Acknowledging that the matter involved both technical considerations and ongoing neighbor-relation issues that could not be fully resolved during the meeting, Council Chairman Calouro suggested continuing the review rather than taking immediate action on the request.

- F4.** Dean Greg Bowman, Roger Williams University, request for Council consideration to proclaim January 30th as Fred Korematsu Day of Civil Liberties and the Constitution

a. (draft) Proclamation

Sweeney/Ley -Voted unanimously to support the Proclamation Declaring January 30th as Fred Korematsu Day of Civil Liberties and the Constitution, and direct the clerk to send to the 38 other Rhode Island municipalities

Prior to the vote being taken, Dean Gregory Bowman, Dean of the Roger Williams University School of Law, addressed the Council to request consideration of issuing a proclamation declaring January 30, 2026, as *Fred Korematsu Day of Civil Liberties and the Constitution* in the Town of Bristol. Dean Bowman provided background on Fred Korematsu's legal challenge to the World War II internment of Japanese Americans, noting that his conviction was upheld by the United States Supreme Court in 1944 based on claims of military necessity, and that the decision was later widely recognized as a grave injustice. He referenced subsequent acknowledgment of this injustice by Congress, President Clinton, and, indirectly, the Supreme Court in its 2018 decision in *Hawaii v. United States*. Dean Bowman further noted that similar proclamations were being pursued in Barrington, at the State House, and by the Governor, and he invited the public to attend a Korematsu Day commemorative event at Roger Williams University.

Councilman Sweeney moved approval of the proclamation and spoke in support of the request, emphasizing the importance of remembering periods in history when government actions resulted in unequal treatment, and the need to uphold fairness and equal rights.

Councilman Ley seconded the motion and offered additional remarks, stating that he had studied and taught the Korematsu case and viewed it as a significant example of the tension between wartime security and civil liberties. He referenced the 6-3 Supreme Court decision, later apologies and reparations to survivors, and the lasting impact on individuals and families who were displaced and lost property. He also noted the involvement of local and regional partners, including the Japan America Society of Rhode Island, as well as university and community organizations.

Vice Chairwoman Parella thanked Dean Bowman for bringing the matter before the Council and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to learn more about the historical significance of Fred Korematsu

G. Appointments

G1. Tree Warden - one-year term set to expire January 2027

a. Steven Saracino, 219 A Queens River Drive - interest/reappointment

b. recommendation - Town Administrator Contente

Teixeira/Parella- Voted unanimously to reappoint Steven Saracino as the Tree Warden with a term set to expire in January 2027

Prior to the vote being taken, Council members spoke in support of the reappointment, citing Mr. Saracino's effective service to residents and his professional handling of matters involving tree management, which were noted to be sensitive issues. The Council President commented on Mr. Saracino's respectful and courteous manner in dealing with the public.

Chairman Calouro requested that the Clerk note, for consideration by a future Charter Review Commission, a potential Charter amendment to change the Tree Warden's term from one year to a two-year term. Clerk Cordeiro stated that she believed the current one-year term may be tied to existing state legislation and noted that any proposed change would require advance review of applicable statutory requirements. She advised that she would review the matter and report back to the Council.

G2. Board of Fire Engineers (terms to expire February 2027)

a. recommendation- Fire Chief DeMello

Teixeira/Parella- voted unanimously in favor of the slate of candidates for the ensuing term based on the recommendation of the Fire Chief.

G3. North & East Burial Grounds Commission - One (1) five-year expired term ending January 2031; one (1) five-year unexpired (*auxiliary member*) term ending January 2028; and one (1) five-year unexpired term ending January 2029.

a. Joshua Cabral, 192 Wood Street - letter of resignation

b. Salome Farya, 367 High Street - interest/appointment

Teixeira/Sweeney- Voted unanimously to accept this resignation and to instruct the Clerk to send a letter of thanks for service; and to advertise in the local paper. Also to instruct the Clerk to set a special meeting for interviews to be held at the next council meeting of February 18, 2026, or at the convenience of the parties

G4. Rogers Free Library Board of Trustees - 2 three-year terms set to expire January 2029

a. Kasey Feijo, 667 Metacom Avenue, Unit 16 - resignation

b. Marie Knapman, 14 Goulart Avenue - interest/reappointment

Parella/Sweeney- Voted unanimously to accept this resignation and to instruct the Clerk to send a letter of thanks

for service; and to advertise in the local paper. And to reappoint Marie Knapman to the Rogers Free Library Board of Trustees with a term set to expire in January 2029.

- G5.** Special Constables/Fire Police appointments to fill one-year term(s) set to expire January 2027

a. Recommendation: Fire Chief DeMello

Teixeira/Parella- voted unanimously in favor of the slate of candidates for the ensuing term based on the recommendation of the Fire Chief.

- G6.** Special Constables/Private Investigators, Matrons & Retiree Officers - appointments to fill one-year term(s) set to expire January 2027

a. recommendation - Police Chief Lynch

Teixeira/Sweeney- voted unanimously in favor of the slate of candidates for the ensuing term based on the recommendation of the Police Chief.

At the conclusion of the board appointments, Chairman Calouro took a moment to express his deep gratitude and appreciation for all members of the community who volunteer their time to serve on one of the town's many boards and commissions. He acknowledged the invaluable contributions of these individuals, recognizing their commitment to the betterment of the community. Chairman Calouro emphasized the importance of their selfless efforts in helping to shape and enhance the town's governance. On behalf of himself and the members of the council he extended a heartfelt thank you to all those who dedicated their time and expertise to the collective well-being of the community.

H. Old Business

- H1.** RI State Police- Office of the Superintendent and Director of Public Safety requests approval of the installation of a Flock Safety camera in the Town of Bristol **(continued from 11/12/2025)**

- a. (Draft) RISP policy (written directive)
- b. (Draft)MOU between the RISP and Bristol Police Department
- c. (Draft) Bristol Police Department policy on ALPR (Flock)
- d. Chief Kevin M. Lynch - ALPR (Flock) Comments and Research for the Bristol Town Council
- e. Copy of resolution passed by the Bristol Town Council in 2017 (To Protect Immigrants in the Town of Bristol)
- f. Director Mark Porter, RWU Public Safety- Letter of Support
- g. Sharon and Warren Wollschlager- 123 Beach Road- Letter of Opposition
- h. Members of Stand-up RI- Letter of Concern

Ley/Sweeney- motion to deny the installation of the automated license plate reader (ALPR) cameras. Voting in Favor were Ley and Sweeney. Voting Opposed were Calouro, Parella, and Teixeira. Motion Failed.

Teixeira/Parella- motion to approve the Flock Safety Camera Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Rhode Island State Police, subject to the following conditions:

- **Scope and Limitation:** Approval is limited to the installation and activation of one (1) camera. Any additional cameras, relocation, expansion, or material change shall require prior Town Council approval.
- **Review Period:** The MOU and use of the technology shall be subject to a one-year review by the Town Council following installation.

- **Changes to Technology or Use:** Any changes to the technology, data use, access, or operational policies shall be brought before the Town Council prior to implementation.
- **Ordinance Review:** The Town Council shall refer this matter to the Town Solicitor and the Chief of Police to draft proposed ordinance language establishing legislative parameters governing the use of the technology, including misuse provisions and opt-out authority for the Town, and public-facing procedures for residents to submit complaints or concerns. The proposed ordinance shall be returned to the Town Council for review and consideration. Installation of the cameras shall be contingent upon the adoption of a Town ordinance codifying the MOU and addressing the concerns expressed by the Council.
- **Auditing and Reporting:** The Bristol Police Department shall conduct quarterly internal audits. The Chief of Police shall provide the Town Council with quarterly written summaries confirming that required audits were conducted and certifying compliance, along with any aggregated, non-identifying information as permitted.
- **Legal Review and Certification:** Final execution of the MOU and all related policies shall be subject to review and written certification by the Town Solicitor confirming compliance with applicable state law and policy requirements.
- **Conditions for Activation:** Activation of the camera is contingent upon compliance with:

- o The fully executed Rhode Island State Police-Town of Bristol MOU
- o Rhode Island State Police General Order 80G
- o Bristol Police Department General Order 300.25

Voting in favor: Calouro, Parella, Teixeira, and Sweeney; Voting Opposed Ley.

Prior to the vote being taken, Clerk Cordeiro noted three (3) received at meeting items: Letter of concern from the ACLU; Written correspondence from David Perry, 15 Ambrose Court; and Letter of concern from Margaret Elise Richards, 15 Ambrose Court.

Chairman Calouro explained that this item is not a formal public hearing; however, the Council will allow public comment. He outlined the process, stating that the Council will first hear presentations from the Rhode Island State Police and the Bristol Police Department, after which the floor will be opened for public comment. Chairman Calouro also set expectations for speakers, noting that while there is no strict time limit, comments should be concise and avoid repetition, and that he may limit remarks if speakers go on at length.

Chief Lynch thanked the Council for the opportunity to speak, stating that the matter is an important issue for the Town of Bristol and public safety. He introduced several law-enforcement officials invited to participate in the discussion:

- **Colonel Michael Winquist**, Cranston Police Department, Secretary of the Rhode Island Police Chiefs Association, noting that Cranston is one of the longest-running communities using the Flock system.
- Captain Steven St. Pierre, a 23-year veteran of the Bristol Police Department, Bristol resident, and Detective Division Commander.
- **Lieutenant Jonathan Primiano**, Providence Police Department, responsible for technology and computer crimes and the Real-Time Crime Center and involved in the Brown University shooting investigation.
- **Captain Album**, representing the Rhode Island State Police Flock program and related policies.

Chief Lynch stated that he prepared his remarks to address issues and concerns raised formally and informally in the community, as well as research related to privacy and policy considerations.

Chief Lynch thanked residents who oppose the program, stating that he listened to their concerns. He noted that safeguards and guardrails were incorporated into Bristol's draft policy and procedures to address privacy issues and stated that, if approved, the program would be administered with a high level of accountability and leadership.

Chief Lynch referenced the Brown University shooting, describing it as a tragic and shocking event, and noted that the suspect was identified with assistance from Flock cameras. He connected this incident to Bristol's ongoing work on school safety in coordination with Roger Williams University, noting that the university has indicated that Flock can be a valuable investigative tool when appropriate privacy safeguards are in place.

Chief Lynch emphasized his responsibilities as Chief of Police, including locating missing or abducted children, finding seniors with dementia or mental illness, and responding to Silver and Purple Alerts. He stated that incidents similar to the Brown University shooting could occur in quiet communities and that Bristol hosts a university campus.

Chief Lynch explained that the Flock system captures an image of a vehicle's rear license plate and hatch and checks the plate against the NCIC database. He stated that the system does not identify vehicle ownership or the driver. He compared the technology to a person photographing a license plate in public, Department of Transportation traffic cameras, and toll transponder systems, noting that Flock is not uniquely intrusive when compared to other existing surveillance tools.

Chief Lynch posed a hypothetical question regarding whether, if the Council declines to adopt Flock, he would be prohibited from requesting assistance from other agencies that utilize the system—such as the Rhode Island State Police or neighboring departments—to run investigative information through their systems in the event of a serious incident involving a missing person or violent crime. He stated that he would respect the Council's decision and sought clarification on the scope of permissible investigative collaboration.

Colonel Winkvist thanked the Council and Chief Lynch for the opportunity to speak and stated that he appeared in support of

Chief Lynch and the proposed Flock ALPR program. He noted that Cranston has operated 29 Flock cameras since 2020 and was the first department in Rhode Island to fully deploy the system. He stated that Bristol would not incur any direct cost under the proposal and that many concerns he has heard publicly about the technology are, in his view, exaggerated or based on misunderstandings.

Colonel Winquist explained that the system captures a still image of the rear of passing vehicles, which is encrypted and transmitted to cloud storage using banking-level encryption and is not stored on the camera itself. The data retained consists of a vehicle image, date, time, and camera location, and does not include vehicle ownership, driver identity, or other personal identifying information. He stated that cameras are intentionally angled to capture license plates rather than faces and that the system focuses on vehicles, not individuals.

He explained that as vehicles pass, plates are automatically checked against the FBI-managed NCIC database for stolen vehicles or plates, wanted persons associated with vehicles, Amber Alerts, Silver Alerts, missing or endangered persons, and stolen property. He acknowledged that Bristol is among the safest communities in Rhode Island but stated that crime still occurs and that the goal of the technology is both crime prevention and efficient investigation. He emphasized that large public gatherings in Bristol, including the Fourth of July parade, heighten the importance of having investigative tools available in the event of a serious incident where a suspect flees without a reliable vehicle description.

Colonel Winquist stated that the system provides real-time alerts when stolen vehicles or plates enter a jurisdiction, allowing officers to conduct visual confirmation before taking action and proceeding with a standard investigation. He noted that Cranston uses the system daily without issue and described it as both a deterrent and an effective investigative tool. He stated that officers are trained on the system and operate under strict written policies, which he believes Bristol and the Rhode Island State Police would adopt consistent with Cranston's policy.

He emphasized that the system is used solely for criminal investigations and not for immigration enforcement. He explained that system administrators can disable ICE-related search categories and that any agency granted access must do so under a memorandum of understanding requiring adherence to the same standards. He stated that third-party access is not permitted

and that all searches are logged with user identity, reason, and case number, and are subject to routine audits.

Colonel Winquist stated that law enforcement agencies already have access to more sensitive databases than Flock and emphasized the importance of public trust in law enforcement, noting that officers are entrusted with significant authority and responsibility. He described Cranston's experience with the system, citing approximately 100 stolen vehicles recovered, 17 missing or endangered individuals located, 91 warrant arrests, and 29 stolen-property arrests since deployment.

He provided recent examples, including a same-day suicide intervention in which a vehicle associated with a person threatening self-harm was entered into the system and located within 20 minutes by another jurisdiction, allowing the individual to be intercepted and assisted. He also referenced a Bristol business owner who experienced vehicle damage during a storm and stated that ALPR coverage on major routes could have assisted in identifying the responsible vehicle.

Colonel Winquist referenced a recent federal court decision in Norfolk, Virginia, upholding the constitutionality of license plate reader technology, noting that the court found that such systems do not track the entirety of an individual's movements or constitute continuous surveillance. He also cited similar rulings by the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court and stated that there is no expectation of privacy on public roadways, where both public and private cameras are already prevalent.

He concluded by encouraging the Council to support the request from the Rhode Island State Police and Bristol Police Department, stating that the technology is lawful, constitutional, and effective, and expressing confidence that it would be used responsibly to enhance public safety in Bristol.

Vice Chairwoman Parella noted that there are reportedly approximately 193 Flock cameras statewide and that residents are already frequently captured by such systems when traveling outside Bristol.

In response to a question regarding more intrusive technologies, Colonel Winquist referenced AI-enhanced CCTV systems capable of identifying faces, clothing, and other features, noting that both public entities and private citizens can deploy such systems.

Councilman Sweeney and Councilman Ley asked about audit frequency, scope, and accountability. Colonel Winquist stated

that Cranston conducts audits at least twice per year, reviewing logs of both internal and external searches and randomly selecting approximately 100-200 entries to verify search justification and associated case documentation. He clarified that transparency portal figures may include searches conducted by external agencies.

Councilman Ley referenced data from Cranston's transparency portal indicating a high volume of vehicle detections and searches and asked whether quarterly audits would be sufficient. Colonel Winquist responded that properly conducted random audits at that frequency are adequate.

Vice Chairwoman Parella asked about access controls. Colonel Winquist explained that access is tiered, with patrol officers able to conduct searches, supervisors responsible for managing hot lists, and dispatchers also having access. He stated that the system is web-based, protected by two-factor authentication, and logs all access.

In response to questions regarding data sharing, Colonel Winquist stated that each agency controls whether data is shared locally, statewide, or nationally and that investigators may limit the jurisdictions included in searches.

Chief Lynch clarified that under the proposed memorandum of understanding with the Rhode Island State Police, Bristol Police Department data would not be shared externally. Access would be limited to the Chief, Deputy Chief, Detective Commander (Captain St. Pierre), and a newly appointed Detective Corporal, with detectives required to route access through supervisory approval and enter a case report number. He further stated that during the 2022 pilot program, he disabled the sharing portal and declined to share Bristol data with other agencies.

Captain Steven St. Pierre, Detective Commander, Bristol Police Department stated that he appeared in multiple capacities, including as Detective Commander of the Bristol Police Department, President of IBPO Local 304, and a Bristol resident of more than 20 years. He noted that the police union supports the use of Flock technology.

He recalled previously testifying in support of Flock when the system was used as part of a suicide prevention pilot near the Mount Hope Bridge. He stated that the technology was used responsibly during that pilot, generated no complaints, and was removed transparently upon the pilot's conclusion.

Captain St. Pierre stated that while Bristol is a safe community, it is not immune from crime. He noted that many crimes investigated by the Bristol Police Department involve individuals traveling from other Rhode Island municipalities, neighboring states, or outside the region to commit fraud, theft, and related offenses.

He stated that license plate reader technology has become a common investigative tool in modern policing, particularly in cases involving fraud, retail theft, and narcotics trafficking. He emphasized that, in Bristol, Flock would primarily function as a reactive investigative tool rather than a proactive stolen-vehicle detection system, given the Town's size and traffic patterns. He stated that the technology has proven effective in tracing suspect vehicles across jurisdictions after crimes have occurred.

Captain St. Pierre provided several examples of Bristol investigations involving vehicle travel where license plate reader data played a role:

- 2024 Multi-Town Vehicle Break-Ins: Incidents occurred in Bristol, Warren, and communities on Aquidneck Island. License plate reader data helped identify suspect vehicles and track them to New Haven, Connecticut, where suspects were apprehended by New Haven Police. Firearms and a stolen vehicle were recovered. Bristol-related charges included possession of a stolen motor vehicle, multiple counts of tampering with automobiles, and conspiracy.
- 2025 Fraud Investigation (~\$50,000): Fraud suspects originating from India and traveling from Canada committed fraud in multiple states, including Bristol and Warren. Bristol losses totaled approximately \$50,000. License plate reader data assisted in tracking suspect movements, intercepting some individuals at the Canadian border, and identifying others who fled internationally.
- 2025 Fraud/Embezzlement Case - Thames Street: A fraud case involving approximately \$40,000. License plate reader data in Rhode Island and Massachusetts helped identify and locate the suspect vehicle, leading investigators to Norton, Massachusetts. An arrest warrant was issued, though the suspect remains at large.
- 2025 Narcotics Trafficking Investigation: Cocaine deliveries to Bristol social clubs originating from Rhode Island and Massachusetts communities were investigated using license plate reader data. Bristol Police intercepted

the suspect vehicle and seized narcotics, packaging materials, and related paraphernalia, disrupting the distribution route into Bristol.

Captain St. Pierre also cited incidents in which the absence of local Flock cameras limited investigative outcomes:

- 2025 Stolen Boat and Trailer - Broadcommon Road: Investigators identified a suspect vehicle make and model and determined it likely passed a former Flock camera location. Without active cameras, no license plate data was available.
- 2025 Attempted Breaking and Entering - North Lane: A suspect vehicle was identified by description and believed to have passed a former camera location, where license plate data could have aided identification.
- Business Breaking and Entering - Broadcommon Road: Surveillance video showed a suspect vehicle traveling on Metacom Avenue, likely passing a former Flock location.

In each instance, Captain St. Pierre described license plate reader data as the missing element needed to positively identify suspect vehicles.

Captain St. Pierre stated that the Bristol Police Department does not intend to use Flock primarily for proactive enforcement sweeps. He emphasized its value as an investigative tool and stated that, based on his experience as Detective Commander, resident, and union president, he supports approval of the program.

Lieutenant Primiano stated that he has 28 years of law enforcement experience, including his first four years with the Warren Police Department and the past 24 years with the Providence Police Department. He currently serves as the commanding officer of the Real-Time Crime Center (RTCC) and the Digital Intelligence Unit.

He explained that the RTCC integrates approximately 400 live camera feeds from partner agencies and organizations, as well as approximately 60 Flock license plate reader cameras. He noted that his unit regularly handles public records and privacy-related requests, including those from APRA and the ACLU.

Lieutenant Primiano stated that when members of the public tour the RTCC and observe its operations, many come to understand that the work being done is not general population surveillance. He emphasized that the RTCC does not monitor where individuals

shop or travel without cause and that the focus of the unit is public safety and crime-solving, rather than indiscriminate observation.

Lieutenant Primiano described two significant investigations in which license plate reader technology played a role:

- **Providence Homicide Involving a Child:** In a case involving the shooting death of a seven-year-old child inside a vehicle, investigators initially received limited video footage from nearby surveillance. Lieutenant Primiano stated that within approximately 15 minutes, investigators used Flock and other investigative tools to identify the vehicle and operator, resulting in two individuals being taken into custody.
- **Brown University Shooting:** Lieutenant Primiano stated that investigators initially had only a grainy image of an individual crossing Hope Street. He described the challenge as identifying one individual among many with minimal information. A tip identifying a gray Nissan with Florida license plates led investigators to conduct a Flock search, which produced two possible vehicles. One was eliminated, and the remaining vehicle led investigators to the identified suspect. He emphasized that Flock served as an initial investigative step and that additional evidence collection, warrant applications, and traditional investigative work were required to advance the case.

Lieutenant Primiano stated that Providence Police Department limits access to and sharing of Flock data through memoranda of understanding. He noted that such agreements prohibit the use of Providence data for federal immigration or ICE enforcement purposes. He emphasized that Flock is one tool within a broader investigative framework and that its use is governed by policy requirements and audit procedures.

Captain Album- RI State Police- stated that, at a prior Council meeting, the Council requested a formal written policy from the Rhode Island State Police regarding the use of automated license plate reader (ALPR) technology. He submitted the applicable State Police general order governing ALPR usage (General Order 80-).

Vice Chairwoman Parella asked about the status of state legislation addressing ALPRs noting that bills have been introduced in the General Assembly over multiple legislative sessions to codify statewide ALPR standards, but none have been enacted to date.

Chief Lynch, speaking in his capacity as former President and current Legislative Chair of the Rhode Island Police Chiefs Association, stated that the Association supports codifying uniform ALPR standards in state law but noted that advancement of such legislation is within the discretion of the General Assembly.

Councilman Ley asked whether Bristol could unilaterally remove a Flock camera if installed and whether the Town could prohibit sharing of its data with other agencies.

Captain Album responded that while the cameras are technically owned by the Rhode Island State Police, if the Town of Bristol no longer wishes to participate, the Town may notify the State Police, who would coordinate removal of the cameras with the vendor.

Regarding data sharing, Captain Album stated that the State Police manage overall network sharing. He noted that the program model involves statewide law-enforcement sharing.

Councilors asked who conducts audits, how misuse would be addressed, and how residents could file complaints.

Captain Album stated that the State Police will conduct audits of Flock usage during the initial phase of the program. Chief Lynch noted that while the ALPR policy does not contain a stand-alone complaint section, any misuse would be addressed through existing Internal Affairs or Professional Standards processes.

Chief Lynch explained that both the Rhode Island State Police and Bristol Police Department maintain state and national accreditation and formal Internal Affairs procedures. He stated that any complaint alleging misuse may be filed through existing departmental complaint mechanisms would result in an investigation, and that the complainant would receive written findings.

Councilman Ley asked whether policies should explicitly describe how residents can file ALPR-related complaints and whether individuals would be notified if their data were misused. Chief Lynch stated that, based on his experience as a formal Internal Affairs investigator and his familiarity with internal investigations within the Bristol Police Department, complaints do not go unanswered. While noting that he was not speaking on behalf of the Rhode Island State Police, he stated that he is confident similar procedures are in place at the state level.

Chief Lynch stated that he supports adding explicit disclosure and notification provisions at the local level through ordinance or policy and expressed no objection to committing to notify individuals if misuse is substantiated, if the council so chooses.

Chief Lynch noted that Rhode Island license plate numbering formats may generate false positives where identical numbers appear on different plate types. He emphasized that Flock alerts are investigative starting points and that officers must visually confirm and verify information before taking action.

Councilman Ley raised concerns regarding the federal 287(g) program and whether officers in other states with immigration enforcement authority could access Rhode Island data for civil immigration purposes.

Chief Lynch emphasized that the Bristol Police Department operates under a Council-adopted non-cooperation policy regarding civil immigration enforcement and has written policies prohibiting the use of local resources for such purposes. Captain Album stated that the State Police control access to their Flock network and require memoranda of understanding with consistent restrictions for participating agencies.

They acknowledged that the State Police cannot guarantee how other states operate their independent systems but stated that MOUs would not be executed with agencies unwilling to comply with access restrictions, including prohibitions on immigration enforcement use.

Vice Chairwoman Parella referenced a recently received letter from the ACLU outlining concerns and recommended policy changes and asked whether the State Police would reconsider their policy in light of those recommendations.

Captain Album stated that he reviewed the ACLU correspondence with State Police legal counsel and that the department believes its policy is sufficient and constitutional.

Councilman Sweeney asked about procedures in the event of a data breach, referencing recent incidents in Rhode Island involving the release of personal information by third-party vendors, and inquired what process would apply if a breach occurred involving the Flock system.

Captain Album responded that Flock acts as an immediate responder in the event of any suspected breach and can be contacted directly. He stated that the Rhode Island State Police

Computer Crimes Unit would also be involved and noted that the contract with Flock includes a \$20 million insurance policy.

Lieutenant Premiano clarified that data stored by the system consists of license plate information, vehicle characteristics, date, time, and location, and does not include personal identifying information such as names or addresses.

Vice Chairwoman Parella noted that certain concerns raised by the ACLU, such as formal complaint procedures, could potentially be addressed through local ordinance or policy even if not included in State Police regulations.

Chairman Calouro stated that the Council has a high level of trust in the Bristol Police Department and Chief Lynch, as well as the Rhode Island State Police. He noted that this trust has been earned over time through professional conduct and performance. He clarified, however, that questions raised by Council members and the public are not intended as criticism of the departments but reflect the Council's responsibility when considering approval of powerful surveillance technologies.

Chief Lynch acknowledged that there are residents who oppose the program and stated that he respects those positions. He noted that past feedback, including correspondence from the ACLU in 2022, informed policy development and transparency measures, including public disclosure of camera locations. He stated that community concerns have helped strengthen policies, audits, and oversight and emphasized his commitment to administering any approved system with accountability and leadership, noting that maintaining a legacy of professional excellence within the Bristol Police Department is important to him.

Councilman Teixeira stated that the Council received numerous emails both in support of and in opposition to the proposed Flock program and thanked residents for their input. He noted that several comments opposing the program stood out to him, including statements such as *"I'm willing to accept the risk of more crime in exchange for freedom of movement and more personal privacy," "Protection from surveillance and privacy for all citizens is more important than catching a few criminals,"* and *"Some things are more important or sacred than safety."*

Councilman Teixeira stated that he strongly disagrees with those sentiments and emphasized that Council decisions affect Council members personally as residents, homeowners, parents, and grandparents. He stated that public safety is deeply important to him and expressed the view that maintaining Bristol's current level of safety requires providing the Police Department with

appropriate modern tools. He further stated that declining to act solely because Bristol is currently a safe community is not, in his view, acceptable and that failing to equip law enforcement appropriately would be a disservice to the community

Vice Chairwoman Parella raised the concern that opposition to the ALPR program stems in part from the absence of formal legislation and suggested that the existing agreements and policies could be codified through a local ordinance governing ALPR use in Bristol.

Town Solicitor Teitz confirmed that the Town has authority to adopt such an ordinance incorporating policy elements.

Councilman Ley stated that he could not support the program without a local ordinance or statewide legislation, noting that any ordinance should be stringent, limit the number of cameras, and include enhanced transparency measures, and expressed interest in further public input.

Robert Botelho, 11 Broadcommon Road, Mr. Botelho addressed the Council in opposition to the Rhode Island State Police proposal requesting approval for the deployment of Flock automated license plate reader (ALPR) cameras in the Town of Bristol. He stated that he has been a Bristol resident for more than 50 years and that his remarks were intended to respond to the proposal presented at the November 12 meeting, as well as to address concerns raised by residents during subsequent public comment and correspondence. He stated that, in his view, several inaccuracies, omissions, and unresolved questions remained and that his testimony was offered to help bridge a knowledge gap for both the public and Council members.

Mr. Botelho outlined his professional background, noting more than 25 years of experience as a security consultant providing physical security, intelligence, and protective services to federal government entities and Fortune 500 companies worldwide. He stated that he holds a bachelor's degree in criminal justice and a Master's degree in Intelligence Collection, is certified as a Department of Homeland Security Intelligence Fusion Center analyst and is trained as a Technical Surveillance Countermeasures (TSCM) technician. He further stated that he managed the nation's first covert operational deployment of facial recognition technology at Logan International Airport following the September 11 attacks. In addition, he noted that he recently conducted a pre-engineering study for a Fortune 500 company evaluating potential deployment of Flock cameras. He stated that he shared this background to provide technical context and emphasized that it was difficult for him to oppose a

law-enforcement proposal, noting his respect for Chief Lynch and stating that his opposition was not anti-police in nature.

Mr. Botelho characterized Flock Safety as an artificial-intelligence surveillance technology company rather than a traditional public-safety vendor. He stated that the company has been in operation for approximately five years, has deployed more than 100,000 cameras nationwide, and has engaged in significant lobbying efforts at the federal level. He referenced Flock's U.S. patent filings, stating that they describe machine-learning and classification capabilities beyond basic license-plate capture. He asserted that, in addition to license plates, the system captures vehicle characteristics and other contextual details and argued that this broader capability contrasts with public descriptions emphasizing "plates only."

Mr. Botelho described what he identified as three pathways for accessing ALPR data. The first, which he referred to as the "front door," involves direct and authorized access by agencies formally permitted to use the system. The second, the "back door," involves unauthorized access through hacking or cybersecurity breaches. The third, which he described as the most problematic, is "side-door" access, whereby one agency with authorized access informally queries data on behalf of another entity that lacks permission to access the system directly. He stated that, based on his experience, this practice has occurred historically in other jurisdictions and has enabled federal agencies, including immigration enforcement entities, to obtain ALPR data even in states with laws restricting such use.

Mr. Botelho raised concerns regarding data storage and retention practices. He stated that ALPR data may be stored locally on cameras for a limited period before being transmitted to vendor servers, after which it is retained for a defined operational period. He further asserted that data may be stored or archived within cloud infrastructure beyond the operational retention window and expressed concern that longer-term storage could enable pattern-of-life analysis or future uses beyond those currently disclosed.

He further discussed facial recognition and biometric analysis, stating that Flock's patent filings reference the capability to analyze human attributes and that the absence of such features in local deployment would be a policy choice rather than a technical limitation. He argued that public discussion of the technology has understated these potential capabilities.

Mr. Botelho addressed legal and constitutional concerns, stating that the United States Supreme Court has not ruled directly on

ALPR technology. He referenced *Carpenter v. United States* as a relevant precedent regarding long-term location tracking and argued that large-scale ALPR deployments could create comprehensive records of individuals' movements similar to historical cell-site location data. He also referenced ongoing federal litigation involving ALPR systems in other jurisdictions, stating his belief that such cases may ultimately be reviewed by higher courts.

He raised concerns regarding public records disclosure, stating that courts in other states have found ALPR images to be public records and argued that, under Rhode Island's Access to Public Records Act, most ALPR images not tied to active investigations could be subject to disclosure. He expressed concern that large-scale disclosure could enable misuse of location data.

Mr. Botelho also discussed false positives and system limitations, stating that environmental factors such as weather, glare, and image quality can affect accuracy and potentially lead to misidentification. He expressed concern that reliance on inaccurate data could result in improper stops or enforcement actions.

He raised questions regarding municipal liability, stating that while qualified immunity may protect individual officers, municipalities may face legal exposure for policy decisions, training, or oversight failures if clear safeguards are not established.

Mr. Botelho stated that his opposition was grounded in Fourth Amendment protections rather than opposition to law enforcement. He requested that the Council reject the Rhode Island State Police Flock proposal, remove any existing ALPR cameras within the Town, and consider establishing a working group with resident participation to develop a local ordinance or policy governing ALPR use with strong privacy and constitutional safeguards.

Councilman Sweeny clarified for the record that the Town of Middletown has, in fact, approved the use of Flock cameras.

Mr. Loren Byrne of Paull Street addressed the Council in opposition to the proposed installation of Flock automated license plate reader (ALPR) cameras. He stated that while he had prepared written remarks, he first wished to address governance and oversight issues raised earlier in the meeting. Mr. Byrne stated his understanding that the Rhode Island State Police would own the cameras and oversee key policies governing their use and expressed concern that any local ordinance adopted by

the Town may not supersede State Police control or the broader objective of creating a statewide or national camera network. He cautioned the Council against assuming that a local ordinance alone would resolve the concerns raised by opponents.

Mr. Byrne stated that he believes the risks associated with the proposed system—both immediate and long-term—outweigh what he characterized as assumed, but not guaranteed, benefits. He described ALPR networks as complex systems involving uncertainty, unpredictability, and unintended consequences that may emerge over time due to technical errors or unethical human decisions. He referenced reports of camera footage being mistakenly broadcast online, including footage involving a schoolyard, and investigative reporting showing ALPR databases being used to track protesters in some communities.

Mr. Byrne emphasized that Flock cameras differ from traditional closed-network cameras because they are AI-based and connected to a national, corporate-controlled network. He stated that comparisons to other surveillance systems are therefore inappropriate. He further asserted that the cameras are operated by a for-profit company whose primary motivation is profit, potentially at the expense of community well-being, individual rights, and transparency. He referenced reporting challenging claims that Flock cameras reduce crime, noting that crime rates in some communities have remained stable or increased.

Mr. Byrne expressed skepticism that local policies could meaningfully control data once it enters a national network. He cited reported incidents in other jurisdictions involving misuse of surveillance data and argued that as data volumes increase, the likelihood of harm to innocent individuals also increases.

He raised concerns regarding artificial intelligence more broadly, stating that AI systems present evolving and uncontrollable risks and that future corporate or governmental leadership could alter current policies. He also raised concerns related to public records laws, noting that photographs constitute data and may be subject to disclosure.

Mr. Byrne referenced recent reporting indicating that Flock has allowed customers to request short video clips or near-real-time footage in addition to still images, which he argued undermines claims that the technology is limited to license plate capture and could lead to broader surveillance capabilities in the future.

He stated that ALPR systems are susceptible to hacking and rejected the argument that widespread surveillance justifies

additional cameras. He also questioned the long-term effectiveness of ALPRs, stating that criminals may increasingly evade detection while risks to innocent individuals increase due to misidentification.

In closing, Mr. Byrne stated that he does not believe the limited number of cases potentially aided by the technology outweigh the broader risks and unknowns, particularly risks to innocent residents and loss of local control. He stated that he would not feel safer with the installation of such cameras and urged the Council to reject the proposal and exercise its authority to prevent installation within the Town. He requested that his statement be entered into the record and presented it to the Town Clerk.

Mr. Perry addressed the Council in opposition to the proposed installation of Flock automated license plate reader (ALPR) cameras. He stated that he had previously submitted written comments to the Council and would summarize his concerns verbally.

Mr. Perry described a personal family experience involving alleged misuse of law-enforcement tracking technology, stating that his sister was stalked by a former partner who was a law-enforcement officer. He referenced the discovery of a law-enforcement-issued tracking device attached to her vehicle and expressed concern that ALPR systems could enable similar misuse remotely and at scale. He clarified that he was not alleging misconduct by the Bristol Police Department but cited an example to illustrate the potential for abuse of surveillance tools.

Mr. Perry stated that he is an attorney and offered comments from a civil liability perspective based on his review of the proposed memorandum of understanding (MOU). He referenced recent legal settlements in other jurisdictions involving wrongful arrests or stops linked to ALPR data, including settlements in Colorado and elsewhere. He stated that the issue of potential civil liability for the Town of Bristol had not been sufficiently discussed.

Mr. Perry stated that a municipality may face liability under negligence law if a legal duty exists and is breached. He argued that without clear state law or local ordinance governing ALPR use, the proposed MOU could effectively establish Bristol's standard of care, and that any improper or accidental data disclosure could expose the Town to legal liability, thereby increasing its potential legal risk.

Mr. Perry also addressed constitutional considerations, stating that Fourth Amendment standards of "reasonableness" evolve over time based on societal expectations. He referenced a U.S. Supreme Court decision allowing aerial surveillance on the grounds that such observation had become commonplace. He expressed concern that expanding surveillance infrastructure could normalize warrantless observation and lower constitutional protections over time.

Finally, Mr. Perry questioned the premise that the ALPR system is being offered at no cost to the Town, stating that he is skeptical of any technology offered "for free" and suggesting that broader strategic or financial interests may underlie the proposal.

Ms. Nancy Hood of Wood Street addressed the Council in opposition to the installation of Flock automated license plate reader (ALPR) cameras in Bristol. She identified herself as a member of Stand Up Rhode Island, a grassroots organization focused on democratic preservation, and a founding member of East Bay Citizens for Peace, a nonpartisan peace and justice group established in Bristol more than 20 years ago. She stated that opposition to ALPR technology is a nonpartisan issue that has raised concerns nationwide and across the political spectrum, noting that some municipalities, including neighboring communities, have declined installation or ended contracts due to liability and civil liberties concerns.

Ms. Hood stated that her opposition is rooted in concerns about the current national climate and what she described as threats to democratic principles. While expressing respect for Chief Lynch and clarifying that she supports effective crime-solving and public safety, she stated that she does not believe ALPR technology is used solely for those purposes. She expressed concern about who beyond local law enforcement may access ALPR data and how it may be used.

Ms. Hood cited examples of ALPR systems being used in other jurisdictions to track immigrants and monitor individuals engaged in peaceful protest. She referenced a report by the Electronic Frontier Foundation describing ALPR data searches related to public demonstrations conducted by multiple federal, state, and local agencies. She also referenced reporting describing federal enforcement activities and expressed concern that individuals exercising First Amendment rights may be subject to surveillance and mischaracterization.

Ms. Hood stated that these practices raise serious civil liberties concerns and urged the Council to carefully consider

the broader implications of approving ALPR technology. She encouraged the Council to follow the example of other nearby communities and oppose the installation of Flock cameras in Bristol

Mr. Vinciguerra of Lea Drive addressed the Council in opposition to the proposed installation of Flock automated license plate reader (ALPR) cameras. He stated that he has served as a first responder with the Bristol Fire Department for five years and has also been active as a local Cub Scout leader. He emphasized that he has worked alongside the Bristol Police Department on numerous calls and stated that his remarks were not intended as criticism of local law enforcement.

Mr. Vinciguerra stated that his opposition is based on concerns regarding privacy, freedom of movement, and surveillance. He expressed distrust of large-scale surveillance systems involving artificial intelligence and data aggregation and stated that he believes such systems could be used to track individuals' movements and behaviors beyond their stated purpose. He framed his remarks in historical and constitutional terms, referencing American founding principles and a quotation attributed to Benjamin Franklin regarding liberty and security.

During his remarks, Mr. Vinciguerra directed comments toward Councilman Teixeira. Chairman Calouro intervened and instructed the speaker to address his remarks to the Council as a whole and reminded all speakers that personal or direct remarks toward individual Council members are not permitted. Mr. Vinciguerra acknowledged the direction and continued his comments.

Mr. Vinciguerra concluded by stating that surveillance technologies, once implemented, are difficult to reverse and urged the Council to consider the long-term consequences of approving such systems.

Warren Wollschlager Beach Road, Bristol (with his wife, Sharon Wollschlager, present)

Mr. Wollschlager addressed the Council in opposition to the proposed installation of Flock automated license plate reader (ALPR) cameras. He thanked the Chair and Council for the opportunity to speak and for holding a public and transparent discussion on the issue. He stated that he and his wife had submitted extensive written testimony prior to the meeting and that those materials were intended to be part of the Council's record.

Mr. Wollschlager stated that he opposes the installation of Flock cameras for several reasons, including concerns about privacy, the lack of a clear statutory or regulatory framework governing ALPR use in Bristol or Rhode Island, and what he described as the broader implications of enrolling residents in a national surveillance network. He stated that he believes such a system is inconsistent with the values that make Bristol a desirable place to live.

Mr. Wollschlager indicated that his oral remarks would focus primarily on Flock's relationship with federal immigration enforcement agencies. He stated that a key marketing claim by Flock is that customers own and control their data, which in this case would be the Rhode Island State Police. He expressed concern that this claim has not held true in practice, citing an audit conducted by the Illinois Secretary of State in 2025 that found Flock had granted U.S. Customs and Border Protection access to Illinois license plate data without the knowledge or approval of elected officials and in violation of Illinois law. He stated that Flock later acknowledged the access, describing it as part of a pilot program conducted nationally, and asserted that the company promised to pause such activity. Mr. Wollschlager stated that, in his view, this incident demonstrates that Flock cannot be relied upon to honor restrictions on federal access.

Mr. Wollschlager stated that while he respects and trusts the Rhode Island State Police, the Bristol Police Department, and local elected officials, he does not trust Flock as a private company or federal immigration enforcement agencies. He argued that even if the State Police do not authorize data sharing with federal agencies, immigration authorities can access ALPR data through indirect "backdoor" or "side-door" methods without local or state approval. He referenced a University of Washington study from November 2025, which he stated documents such access methods. He noted that Rhode Island currently lacks a comprehensive legal framework regulating ALPR data collection and sharing, which he described as a significant vulnerability.

Mr. Wollschlager further stated that the absence of regulation is notable given that states across the political spectrum—including Idaho, Montana, and Arkansas, as well as more traditionally liberal states—have enacted strict laws governing ALPR use. He argued that Rhode Island's lack of similar safeguards increases risk to residents' civil liberties.

In closing, Mr. Wollschlager expressed grave concern about what he described as nationwide civil rights violations by federal immigration enforcement agencies. He stated that he believes ALPR technology, including Flock, is being used to support such

enforcement actions. He urged the Council to prioritize the protection of residents' privacy and civil liberties and to reject the Flock proposal, joining neighboring communities and others nationwide that have declined to adopt the technology.

Vice Chairwoman Parella responded to concerns that approval of the ALPR program would amount to enrolling the entire town in a surveillance system. She stated that residents are already subject to various forms of camera surveillance when traveling on highways or in neighboring communities and noted that many cities and private properties utilize multiple types of cameras. She acknowledged that different technologies raise different concerns but expressed disagreement with the characterization that the Town would be newly or uniquely enrolling all residents into surveillance.

Vice Chairwoman Parella further noted that public commentary often reflects the views of individuals who are organized and motivated to speak, which she stated is valuable, but emphasized that there are also residents who have expressed support for the Flock cameras or do not oppose them. She stated that it would be inaccurate to conclude that the Council would be disregarding the views of all residents by considering approval.

She emphasized that the Council's responsibility is to consider the broader community as a whole, noting that Bristol has approximately 23,000 residents and that Council decisions must balance differing perspectives and focus on the overall welfare and protection of the entire community, rather than the views of any single group.

Mr. Michael Kane of Mulberry Road addressed the Council in support of the proposed installation of Flock automated license plate reader (ALPR) cameras. He stated that he has lived in Bristol for 23 years and is a retired police officer, having served approximately 26 years with the Pawtucket Police Department. He stated that his perspective is informed by his experience investigating crimes and emphasized that ALPR technology is simply another investigative tool, not a cure-all solution.

Mr. Kane stated that the system captures photographs of vehicles and does not otherwise interfere with daily activities. He expressed that he has no concerns with the technology and indicated his belief that a single camera may be insufficient, suggesting that coverage in both directions would be more effective

Ms. Samantha Faria Franklin Street, Bristol addressed the Council in opposition to the proposed installation of Flock automated license plate reader (ALPR) cameras. She thanked the Council and attendees for remaining late and for engaging in discussion on the issue. She stated that Bristol is already one of the safest communities and expressed confidence in the Town's existing public safety services, noting the close proximity and responsiveness of police, fire, and rescue personnel.

Ms. Faria argued that ALPR cameras are primarily reactive rather than preventative, stating that they do not actively prevent crime but instead may be used only after an incident has occurred. She expressed concern that the promotion of the technology relies on fear and described the cameras as a "new" solution that does not actually increase safety. She also expressed skepticism regarding the vendor's financial incentives.

Ms. Faria suggested that if the Town seeks to improve safety, it should focus on proactive and preventative measures rather than surveillance technology. She referenced potential policy approaches such as stronger gun regulations or local gun-free zones as examples of measures she believed would more directly prevent crime.

She also referenced the Brown University shooting, stating that while technology may assist in identifying suspects after an incident, it does not prevent harm from occurring. Ms. Faria concluded by urging the Council to reject the installation of Flock cameras and to consider alternative strategies focused on prevention and community safety.

Madeline McGonagall, Policy Associate, ACLU of Rhode Island addressed the Council on behalf of the ACLU of Rhode Island. She stated that while she is not a Bristol resident, she wished to echo many of the concerns raised by residents regarding the proposed installation of Flock automated license plate reader (ALPR) cameras.

Ms. McGonagall emphasized that the ACLU's primary concern is the absence of a statutory framework governing ALPR use in Rhode Island. She noted that legislation has been introduced in the General Assembly over the past four legislative sessions that would establish municipal requirements and limit ALPR use to specific purposes, such as stolen vehicles or investigations involving violent or domestic violence offenses. She stated that these legislative efforts have been opposed by police chiefs in recent years. She further stated that, had any of those laws been in effect, they would not have impeded investigations such

as the Brown University shooting, as the data would still have been available within the relevant investigative timeframes.

Ms. McGonagal noted that in the absence of law, local policies default largely to vendor settings, including a 30-day data retention period. She contrasted this with other jurisdictions that have adopted shorter retention periods, citing examples such as Virginia and New Hampshire. She stated that these examples demonstrate that municipalities can and have imposed stricter safeguards.

Ms. McGonagall also addressed estimates regarding the number of Flock cameras in Rhode Island, stating that publicly available figures are imprecise due to limited transparency. She noted that estimates are based on transparency portals and public records requests conducted by the ACLU and offered to provide supporting documentation to the Council.

Ms. McGonagall concerns about false positives, explaining that license plate misreads or outdated "hot list" entries—such as cleared Amber Alerts—can result in vehicles being improperly flagged. She stated that such incidents have been documented and offered to provide additional information to the Council.

Vice Chairwoman Parella commented that the ACLU's document distributed that day was helpful and identified several policy gaps that could warrant consideration should the Council or State proceed with ALPR deployment.

Councilman Sweeney asked about the ACLU's position in prior legislative testimony, noting that the organization had previously expressed support for ALPR legislation. Ms. McGonagall responded that the ACLU recognizes that ALPR technology can serve legitimate law-enforcement purposes when narrowly tailored by law. She reiterated that the organization's concern is the lack of binding legal safeguards, reliance on policies that can change without public process, risks associated with data aggregation and sharing, and the potential for tracking individuals' movements over time.

Ms. McGonagall concluded by stating that these combined concerns led the ACLU to oppose deployment in the absence of clear legislative guardrails and expressed willingness to provide additional materials or answer questions from the Council.

Councilman Ley thanked Ms. McGonagall for the information provided and stated that a recurring theme throughout the discussion has been the need for a statutory framework governing ALPR technology. He noted that while a local ordinance in

Bristol could establish guardrails for cameras within the Town, it would not address the many ALPR cameras already operating throughout Rhode Island. He referenced examples from other municipalities, such as Cranston, where large volumes of vehicles are captured as people travel through those jurisdictions.

Councilman Ley emphasized that the broader issue is not only the presence of cameras but the scale of searches and data use occurring statewide. He stated that while he had considered beginning to outline a motion or next steps, he believed the Council had not yet exhausted its discussion on the issue and that further deliberation was needed before proceeding.

Mr. James A. Annis of Kingswood Road addressed the Council in support of the proposed installation of Flock automated license plate reader (ALPR) cameras. He stated that he moved to Bristol in 1979 while serving in the U.S. Coast Guard, where he spent 19 of his 20 years as a federal law enforcement officer. He later served as a police officer for the Town of Bristol and retired in 2016. He noted that his son, James D. Annis, was also present and supports the program.

Mr. Annis stated that his support for the technology is based not only on crime investigation but also on public safety concerns involving vulnerable populations, particularly elderly residents. He referenced past incidents during his tenure involving seniors with Alzheimer's disease who became disoriented and drove long distances, stating that ALPR technology could have assisted in locating them more quickly.

He acknowledged concerns raised about data security but stated that data breaches are common across many sectors, including healthcare, and that absolute security is not achievable. He expressed the view that concerns about license plate data should be weighed against the potential public safety benefits.

Mr. Annis stated that he believes the Bristol Police Department performs its duties professionally and responsibly and that ALPR technology would serve as an additional tool available if needed. He emphasized his continued involvement in the community and familiarity with Town operations and reiterated his strong support for the installation of Flock cameras, stating that having the tool available could be critical in emergency situations.

Mr. Annis concluded by urging caution regarding unverified claims and rumors and expressed confidence in local and state law enforcement officials involved in the proposal.

Vice Chairwoman Parella stated that while she agrees a statewide statutory framework governing ALPR technology would be ideal, she does not believe such legislation is likely to pass in the near term. She noted that similar bills have failed in recent years and referenced points raised in the ACLU's letter indicating that the Rhode Island Police Chiefs Association has not supported those efforts. She stated her belief that disagreements over disclosure requirements and usage limitations have prevented consensus. Vice Chairwoman Parella emphasized that, in the absence of state legislation, the Town's only option is to regulate its own involvement locally and asked Chief Lynch to comment on the legislative history.

explained that the Police Chiefs Association previously worked closely with Representative Solomon and came close to advancing ALPR legislation. He stated that negotiations stalled due to proposed requirements for full public disclosure of all camera locations and limitations on the types of crimes for which ALPR data could be used, which law enforcement leaders believed would restrict legitimate investigative and public safety uses, including cases involving business losses and non-violent property crimes. He noted that immigration enforcement was not the focus of those earlier legislative discussions.

Chief Lynch further stated that there was insufficient political will in the General Assembly to advance the bill, as legislators were reluctant to associate themselves with controversial legislation, resulting in the issue being set aside. He emphasized that Rhode Island law enforcement agencies are nationally accredited, operate under extensive internal policies and procedures, and are accountable to municipal leadership rather than elected independently.

Vice Chairwoman Parella asked whether legislative efforts continued in more recent years. Chief Lynch responded that he did not recall renewed momentum on the bill and noted that his recent legislative work focused instead on police accountability reforms, including updates to the Law Enforcement Officers' Bill of Rights and the adoption of body-worn cameras—both of which he supported and helped advance.

Chief Lynch stated that, in his professional opinion, reliance on policies, training, accreditation standards, and case law is consistent with how police departments operate daily, noting that many critical law-enforcement functions—including use-of-force standards—are governed by policy and training rather than statute. He clarified for the record that the court case he previously referenced was Commonwealth v. McCarthy from the

Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, as included in the materials submitted to the Council on November 12, 2025.

Vice Chairwoman Parella noted that residents in communities with multiple cameras often go about daily life without awareness of them and suggested that increased public pressure on legislators might eventually result in statewide legislation, though she acknowledged that such action may not be imminent.

Councilman Ley stated that when the Rhode Island State Police first presented the Flock ALPR proposal to the Council, members lacked sufficient information about how the system operated. He noted that the Council requested a written policy at that time in order to better understand the technology, safeguards, and governance, and that the current discussion was intended to evaluate that policy.

Councilman Ley summarized several concerns raised during the meeting, including that while the Town may be able to request removal of cameras, it does not have full control over how data is shared, cannot guarantee that residents would be notified if their data were misused, and that the proposed audit structure—approximately ten audits per quarter—may be insufficient. He also noted concerns that audits are not independently conducted and that certain safeguards remain unresolved.

Councilman Ley stated that, based on these issues, he does not believe the policy as written is ready for implementation. He indicated that the Council should move toward formal action and made a motion to deny or table the proposal until such time as a statewide statutory framework or policy is adopted that would allow the Council to reconsider the installation of Flock ALPR cameras under clearer legislative guardrails.

A motion was made by Councilman Ley and seconded by Councilman Sweeney to deny the installation of the automated license plate reader (ALPR) cameras. Voting in Favor were Ley and Sweeney. Voting Opposed were Calouro, Parella, and Teixeira. Motion Failed.

Vice Chairwoman Parella stated that she had considered whether the Council should delay action on the Flock ALPR proposal until the General Assembly acts on statewide legislation. However, she expressed skepticism that such legislation would pass in the near future, noting that similar bills have been introduced for several years without success. She stated that legislative processes can take many years and that waiting for state action could result in indefinite delay. Vice Chairwoman Parella emphasized that if the Council believes ALPR technology is a

useful tool, it should decide whether to implement it locally rather than defer action indefinitely. She stated that she does not support a motion to deny the proposal solely on the basis that state legislation has not been enacted.

Councilman Ley responded that his preference for a statewide statutory framework is based on the benefits of uniformity and transparency. He stated that statewide legislation would establish consistent rules across all municipalities and ensure that any changes to ALPR policy would occur through a public legislative process, including committee hearings, written testimony, and public debate. He expressed concern that reliance on internal policies lacks the same level of scrutiny and public accountability and stated that technology of this scope warrants that higher level of oversight.

Vice Chairwoman Parella replied that large-scale surveillance technology is already widespread nationwide and that data breaches and surveillance risks exist across many sectors, including banking and healthcare. She stated that it is not possible to anticipate or prevent every potential data breach and expressed disagreement with the notion that the existence of risk alone justifies denial of the proposal.

Councilman Teixeira stated that the Council has met regularly with state legislators over multiple years and that many issues fail to advance due to lack of advocacy or political will. He expressed the view that waiting for legislative action could take several more years. Councilman Teixeira emphasized that the Bristol Police Department is accredited at both the state and national levels and operates under established professional standards, noting his familiarity with accreditation processes from prior municipal experience. He stated that relying solely on future legislative action is impractical and urged the Council to act independently in what he believes is the best interest of the Town.

Councilman Sweeney stated that penalties for misuse of ALPR data must be clearly defined and enforceable, including administrative discipline, civil liability, and potential criminal consequences in the event of data misuse or breaches. He expressed concern that standards governing accountability and consequences for improper use are not yet fully formulated or consistently applied and stated that individuals handling such data should be held to a higher standard. He acknowledged that these accountability challenges are not unique to Bristol but are occurring broadly in other jurisdictions as well.

Chairman Calouro thanked members of the public for attending the extended meeting, sharing their views, and speaking openly about both concerns and support related to the proposal. He stated that, speaking personally, he supports the Bristol Police Department and believes in a principle of "trust with verification," emphasizing the Council's responsibility to ask questions, listen carefully, and conduct due diligence rather than act blindly.

Chairman Calouro stated that he supports the adoption of statewide legislation governing ALPR technology but does not believe the Town should delay local decision-making while waiting for legislative action that may not occur in a timely manner. He noted that the Council has repeatedly supported efforts by the Police Chiefs Association to advance legislation and expressed concern about the lack of forward momentum at the state level.

He stated that, in his view, ALPR technology could provide meaningful benefit if needed, particularly in emergency situations such as locating an abducted child, where time is critical. He acknowledged that concerns raised by the public are legitimate and should be taken seriously.

Chairman Calouro further stated that if the Council were to approve the proposal, any future changes to the technology, its use, or governing policies should be brought back before the Council for review. He also suggested that the program should be formally reviewed by the Council after one year to ensure compliance with representations made and adherence to established safeguards.

Councilman Teixeira made a motion to approve the memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the Rhode Island State Police for the installation of Flock automated license plate reader (ALPR) cameras, with a formal review of the program after one year. He stated that a shorter review period would not allow sufficient time to evaluate implementation and effectiveness.

Vice Chairwoman Parella seconded the motion and proposed that approval be coupled with additional conditions. She emphasized that while statewide legislation would be preferable, the Town Council serves as a legislative body for Bristol and can adopt a local ordinance to govern ALPR use within the Town. She suggested incorporating relevant safeguards from the policy documents into a Town ordinance, noting that the MOU alone contains fewer details than the policies. She further raised the need for clarity regarding opt-out or termination procedures, misuse reporting mechanisms, and clearer public-facing language explaining how residents can raise concerns.

Chief Lynch stated that while he cannot speak on behalf of the Rhode Island State Police, accredited police departments operate under overarching policies that require strict compliance with all general orders, MOUs, and procedures. He expressed full support for adding clear, accessible language at the Town level describing misuse reporting, internal affairs processes, and audit procedures. He stated that he supports strict scrutiny, including increased audit frequency if desired by the Council, and offered to work with the Town Solicitor to ensure transparency and accountability. He also stated that an independent internal affairs investigator could conduct audits and confirmed his willingness to implement quarterly audits.

Councilman Teixeira indicated that quarterly audits would be sufficient and balanced against staffing demands.

Chairman Calouro asked that the motion also include a requirement that any changes to the technology, its use, or governing policies be brought before the Town Council for approval, and that any ordinance reflect those requirements.

Councilman Sweeney emphasized the importance of maintaining public safety as Bristol prepares for large-scale events, including the Fourth of July and the upcoming America 250 commemorations. He acknowledged residents' concerns regarding privacy, civil liberties, and liability and stressed the need for balance. He summarized that the proposal involves a single ALPR camera at a major entry/exit point, not a traffic enforcement device, and that governing policies prohibit personal use, discriminatory use, First Amendment surveillance, and civil immigration enforcement. He emphasized that searches must be documented, data retention is limited, audits are required, and oversight is essential to maintaining public trust.

Councilman Sweeney then restated and clarified the proposed conditions to be included with the motion, including:

- Final execution of the MOU and all related policies subject to review and written certification by the Town Solicitor confirming compliance with state law and policy requirements;
- Activation of the camera contingent upon compliance with the executed Rhode Island State Police-Bristol MOU and applicable general orders;

- Quarterly written reports to the Town Council from the Chief of Police confirming required audits and summarizing usage in aggregated form;
- Limitation to a single ALPR camera, with any additional cameras requiring prior Town Council approval;
- A formal Council review of the program after twelve (12) months to evaluate compliance, audit results, public safety impact, and adherence to stated safeguards.

Councilman Sweeney stated that these conditions are intended to ensure strict oversight, transparency, accountability, and a clear review process so the public can assess whether the technology is operating as intended while protecting civil liberties.

H2. Kayla DaSilva, 205 Franklin St, Unit 2, requests council consideration to keep Holiday lights installed after Christmas and reactivate them for one month in June or July. **(continued from 1/7/2026)**

a. recommendation - Town Administrator and Director of Public Works

Sweeney/ Teixeira- voted unanimously to deny the petition in its current form and refer to the 250th Committee to consider

Prior to the vote being taken, Chairman Calouro restated that the original petition submitted by Kayla DSilva requested permission to keep the downtown holiday lights installed on the trees after the Christmas season and to reactivate them during June and July for summer events, rather than removing and reinstalling them each year. It was noted for the record that Ms. DaSilva was not present at the meeting.

DPW Director Chris Parella was asked to provide input from an infrastructure and maintenance perspective. He expressed concerns regarding leaving the holiday light strings installed year-round, noting that the lights and associated wiring are part of the Town's physical infrastructure and not solely decorative. He stated that extended installation could result in damage to both the trees and the lighting equipment due to prolonged exposure to weather, wind, and storm conditions, as well as strain on tree branches. He also cited risks of

accelerated deterioration of wiring and fixtures, and raised maintenance, safety, and liability considerations, noting that the current system was not designed for permanent, all-season use.

During discussion, Council members expressed interest in enhanced summer lighting in the downtown area but shared the Department of Public Works' concerns regarding the existing lighting configuration. The Council declined the request in its current form and suggested that alternative lighting options be explored. The matter was referred to the Bristol 250th Committee for consideration of other approaches that would be more compatible with the Town's infrastructure and the long-term health of the trees

I. Other New Business Requiring Town Council Action

- I1.** Discussion and possible action to propose amendments to the Alcoholic Beverage Ordinance to establish a public hearing process when required license documents are not provided in a timely manner

Sweeney/Parella- Voted unanimously to refer this matter to the Town Solicitor so that he may draft language for Council consideration on February 11, 2026

Prior to the vote being taken, Chairman Calouro noted that, due to the nature of the topic and the length of the meeting, he recommended continuing the matter to the next Council meeting to allow for further discussion.

- I2.** (Draft) FY 2026-2027 Budget Schedule
Discussion and possible action to amend the date of the provisional budget vote from April 1, 2026, to March 25, 2026 (Special Town Council Meeting)

Sweeney/Parella- Voted unanimously to adopt the draft budget with the proposed change to amend the provisional budget vote from April 1, 2026, to March 25, 2026 (Special Town Council Meeting).

Prior to the vote being taken, the Council briefly reviewed and adjusted the upcoming budget schedule to ensure compliance with legal notice and public hearing requirements. Clerk Cordeiro

explained that if the provisional budget vote remained scheduled for April 1, the dates for the public hearing and final budget adoption would also need to be changed to meet advertising requirements. To minimize disruption to the overall timeline, she recommended moving the provisional budget vote from April 1 to March 25, while keeping the remainder of the budget schedule intact. The regularly scheduled Council meeting will still occur on April 1.

I3. Director Rensehausen, Bristol Parks and Recreation - Beach Fee Modifications
 Discussion and possible action to amend beach parking and season pass fees, including updates to the Town fee schedule.

a. (Draft) Resolution Bristol Parks and Recreation Beach Parking fee and Season Pass modifications

Teixeira/Sweeney- Voted unanimously to adopt the resolution for beach parking fee and season pass modifications, as amended, as follows:

One-day permit for weekdays:

Category	Current	Proposed	Tax	Total
• Bristol Residents	\$10.00	\$9.35	\$.65	\$10.00
• Nonresidents	\$20.00	\$18.69	\$1.31	\$20.00
• In-town Registered Buses	\$30.00	\$32.71	\$2.29	\$35.00
• Nonresident Buses	\$60.00	\$65.42	\$4.58	\$70.00

One-day permit for Saturdays, Sundays, and Holidays:

Category	Current	Proposed	Tax	Total
• Bristol residents	\$15.00	\$18.69	\$1.31	\$20.00
• Nonresidents	\$30.00	\$37.38	\$2.62	\$40.00
• In-town registered buses	\$30.00	\$32.71	\$2.29	\$35.00
• Nonresident buses	\$60.00	\$65.42	\$4.58	\$70.00

Season Pass:

	Current	Proposed
• Bristol residents	\$20.00	\$10.00

Sweeney/Teixeira- Voted unanimously to refer this matter to the Town Administrator and Community Development to act in the best interest of the Town.

Prior to the vote being taken, Clerk Cordeiro presented the following bid tabulations for the bids received, as outlined below:

- Kimberly Teves, Home Smart in the amount of \$TBD

Prior to the vote being taken, the Council asked about the amount listed as TBD. Director Williamson and Town Administrator Contente explained that the fee structure would need to be negotiated, as this is a unique situation in which compensation is based on individual lease agreements. They noted that the specific terms and fees would require further review and negotiation.

J2. Bid 1080- Stage and Sound-Bristol 4th of July Concert Series 2026

Teixeira/Sweeny- Voted unanimously to refer this matter to the Town Administrator and the 4th of July Committee to act in the best interest of the Town.

Prior to the vote being taken, Clerk Cordeiro presented the following bid tabulations for the bids received, as outlined below:

- Audio Solutions in the amount of \$59,800
- Sound Advice, LLC in the amount of \$84,000

K. Special Reports

L. Town Solicitor

M. Executive Sessions

M1. Executive Session pursuant to R.I. Gen. Laws § 42-46-5(a) (1) for discussion related to the job performance, character, or physical or mental health of a person or persons

Sweeney/Teixeira - Voted unanimously to convene in Executive Session pursuant to RIGL Section 42-46-5 (a) (1) for discussion related to the job performance, character, or physical or mental health of a person or persons at 11:13 PM.

Prior to the vote taken, Town Solicitor Tietz announced for the record that the person affected was notified in advance in writing.

M2. Executive Session pursuant to RIGL § 42-46-5 (a) (5) Discussion or consideration related to the Acquisition or Lease of Real Property

Sweeney/Teixeira - Voted unanimously to convene in Executive Session pursuant to RIGL Section 42-46-5 (a) (5) Discussion or consideration related to the Acquisition or Lease of Real Property at 11:13 PM.

Parella/Teixeira - Voted unanimously to resume open session and seal the minutes of the Executive Session at 11:51PM.

Solicitor Teitz announced that action and a vote was taken in Executive Session.

Consent Agenda Items:

(CA) AA. Submission of Minutes - Boards and Commissions

Approval of consent agenda = "motion to receive and place these items on file"

- (CA) AA1. Bristol Fire Department Board of Engineers Meeting Minutes - January 5, 2026
- (CA) AA2. Zoning Board of Review Meeting Minutes - December 1, 2025
- (CA) AA3. Rogers Free Library Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes - November 20, 2025
- (CA) AA4. Planning Board Meeting Minutes - December 11, 2026
- (CA) BB. Budget Adjustments**
- Approval of consent agenda = "motion to approve these adjustments"**
- (CA) BB1. Tax Assessor Leadem - Recommended Abatement & Additions as of January 28, 2026
- (CA) CC. Financial Reports**
- Approval of consent agenda = "motion to receive and place these items on file"**
- (CA) CC1. Town Treasurer Carulli - YTD - Budget Actuals for the month-end of January
- (CA) DD. Proclamations, Resolutions & Citations**
- Approval of consent agenda = "motion to adopt these Proclamations, Resolutions and Citations as prepared and presented"**
- (CA) DD1. Citation - Caron Jewelers - Recognizes and Congratulates on the Occasion of its 70th Anniversary and Sincere Appreciation for its Many Years of Service to Town of Bristol
- (CA) DD2. Commendation - Congratulates Christopher Stone on Earning the Esteemed Rank of Eagle Scout
- (CA) DD3. Resolution No. 2026-1-07-I1 - Town Council with the Advice of the Bristol Harbor Commission, Desires to Amend the Fee for Off-Season Parking at the Marina Ferry Dock
- (CA) DD4. Resolution No 2026-1-07-I2 Policy for Conducting Bureau of Criminal Identification Checks for Applicants to the Town Board, Commission, Committee, or Town Appointment Positions (signed)

(CA) DD5. Citation - The Portuguese Beneficial Association Dom Luiz Filipe (signed)

(CA) EE. Utility Petitions

Approval of consent agenda = "motion to approve these petitions"

(CA) FF. City & Town Resolutions Not Previously Considered

Approval of consent agenda = "motion to receive and place these items on file"

(CA) FF1. Town of Exeter Resolution no. 2025-08 Regarding the Restoration of General Revenue Sharing to Cities and Towns

(CA) GG. Distributions/Communications

Approval of consent agenda = "motion to receive and place these items on file"

(CA) GG1. Town Clerk Cordeiro to Mr. Steve Pristawa - Referral for review of Traffic Conditions at the Intersection of Jameson Drive and Metacom Ave

(CA) GG2. State Traffic Commission Secretary Sean Raymond to Town of Bristol- regarding the request for installation of an exclusive pedestrian phase at Metacom Ave and Gooding Ave

(CA) GG3. Director of Parks & Recreation, Rensehausen to Town Administrator Contente re BYSA request for Power to storage shed

(CA) GG4. Town Administrator Contente to Peter Squatrito, The Beach Shack re Extension of Bid #1004 - Bristol Town Beach Concession

(CA) GG5. Town Administrator Contente to Courtney Poissant, CP's Catering re Bid Award No. 1076

(CA) GG6. Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority, Mount Hope Bridge - Alternating Lane Closures, Dehumidification Project

(CA) GG7. Rhode Island Cannabis Control Commission re Distribution of Cannabis Licenses

(CA) GG8. State of RI State Traffic Commission to Town of Bristol regarding request for the installation of a traffic signal at Metacom Ave. and Jameson Dr. - **STC Agenda February 4, 2026**

(CA) HH. **Distributions/Notice of Meetings**
(Office copy only)

Approval of consent agenda = "motion to receive and place these items on file"

(CA) HH1. Conservation Commission Meeting - January 6, 2026

(CA) HH2. Harbor Commission Bristol Harbor Protection Team Subcommittee Meeting - January 12, 2026

(CA) HH3. Bristol Republican Town Committee 2026 Calendar

(CA) HH4. Planning Board Meeting - January 8, 2026

(CA) HH5. Bristol Fourth of July Committee Carnival Subcommittee Meeting - January 12, 2026

(CA) HH6. Bristol Fourth of July Committee Ball Subcommittee Meeting - January 12, 2026

(CA) HH7. BCWA Public Hearing Meeting - January 22, 2026

(CA) HH8. Bristol Christmas Festival General Committee Meeting - January 12, 2026

(CA) HH9. Bristol Fourth of July Committee General Committee Meeting - January 15, 2026

(CA) HH10. Rogers Free Library Board of Trustees Meeting - January 15, 2026

(CA) HH11. The North and East Burial Grounds Commission Meeting - January 14, 2026

(CA) HH12. Bristol Housing Authority Meeting - January 22, 2026

(CA) HH13. BCWA Board of Directors Meeting - January 22, 2026

(CA) HH14. Zoning Board of Review Meeting - February 2, 2026

(CA) HH15. Planning Board Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting - January 22, 2026

(CA) HH16. Fourth of July Subcommittee Monte Carlo Night Meeting - January 22, 2026

(CA) HH17. Recreation Board Meeting - January 28, 2026

(CA) HH18. Recreation Board 2026 Meeting Schedule

(CA) II. Claims (Referrals)

Approval of consent agenda = "motion to refer these items to the Insurance Committee and at its discretion to the Interlocal Trust"

(CA) JJ. Miscellaneous Items Requiring Council Approval

Approval of consent agenda = "motion to approve these items"

(CA) KK. Curb cut petitions as approved by the director of public works

Approval of consent agenda = "motion to grant these curb cuts per the recommendation of, and conditions specified by, the Director of Public Works"

There being no further business, upon a motion by Vice Chairwoman Parella, seconded by Councilman Sweeney and voted unanimously, the Chairman declared this meeting to be adjourned at 11:51 pm.

Melissa Cordeiro, Town Clerk
Council Clerk