

From: [Mike Martinez](#)
To: [Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Excessive Noise Proposal Concerns
Date: Tuesday, December 2, 2025 4:10:18 PM



City of Billings,

There is an article I recently read that indicated the city is looking at a city ordinance to address speeding concerns and excessive noise.

While I agree that excessive speeding and racing is extremely dangerous, I am concerned with the article addressing excessive noise.

As a prior law enforcement officer in another city, I support the community protecting the citizens. However, the article indicates that the city is looking at potentially putting into place the following:

"Noise "plainly audible" at 75 feet between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. in residential zones, or noise disruptive to a "person of ordinary sensibilities," could trigger a citation."

I find this concerning due to the fact that 75 feet is less than half a city block. There are factory vehicles that could be "plainly audible" from beyond that distance. Additionally, exhaust systems are marketed as 50' state legal and would also not pass this standard, thus restricting ordinary drivers who are not the issue. This could lead to someone driving home from work being cited for driving a regular vehicle with no ill intention who is not disturbing anyone.

While I do understand why this proposal is likely being made, and I could understand the argument that it is target at those intentionally causing disturbances, this does not resolve the concern I have. A rule of 75 feet that could be violated by a factory vehicle is a subjective issue now. My wife drives a 2025 Silverado Bison ZR2 that had a factory exhaust that would likely be heard beyond the 75 feet plainly audible standard. This is subjective as 20 officers could pass her and not care while one in theory could cite her a ticket if this was to be put in place. This places a burden on private citizens that should not be there based on a subjective standpoint.

Since the idea behind this is likely well intended, I would encourage the city to revisit the 75-foot distance that the article mentioned. If the article is wrong, I apologize for this long email, but if it is not and that is being considered, I would encourage the city to look beyond that distance. A city block averages approximately 250 foot if I recall correctly. While typing this I just heard a factory vehicle inside my home approximately half a city block away.

I would encourage the city to properly assess this prior to making any determination on distance as this would highly impact a large sum of the city. Especially when you

include older vehicles that are loud, old and new trucks as they tend to be louder (not all), people who cannot afford nicer vehicles and have to buy used and that used vehicle may be loud, etc.

I, much like a lot of people, do not want to hear loud vehicles in the middle of the night. I also have a built sports car that has to have a larger exhaust (I do not drive it at night though), so I understand the desire people have, but a rule of 75 feet would hinder someone who likely should not be in my opinion.

Thank you for your time and I hope this will be properly assessed for a reasonable outcome. Thank you again.

Respectfully,

Michael Martinez

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: [Rich Caporali](#)
To: [Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Flock Cameras
Date: Tuesday, December 2, 2025 12:49:51 PM

Dear Council and City Government

During last night's work session there was a long portion of the meeting dedicated to traffic issues we are facing as a community. Speeding and noise ARE a serious issues, and as we've seen with numerous accidents over the past couple years, life altering or life ending.

One council member brought up closing lanes or restricting traffic in certain areas to force people to slow down... which makes zero sense. What is the point of building or improving Infrastructure (which we need to do), if we are going to discourage people from using it, or restrict its usage. This is a completely moronic mindset.

Additionally, the use of cameras was brought up. While on the surface this seems to be a reasonable approach, and using Public Service Officers to watch the videos as witnesses really sounds like a good idea...I'd encourage the council to use the internet and look at the issues with flock cameras and privacy across the country. It's a system that's good in theory, but one that has been abused by local governments and one that leads to a nanny or surveillance state.

I think the best, and most reasonable solution is something I've advocated for the past five years. More cops on the streets, and harsher penalties for infractions. By this I mean raising the cost of tickets so people actually learn from their mistakes instead of repeatedly giving them lesser penalties. Maybe a warning ticket for first infraction, then a \$250 fine for the second and subsequent offenses. Sometimes the only way people learn is when you make a lesson painful.

As far as officers on the street, this is why I'm furious about the downtown sector getting three dedicated officers to deal with the homeless and drugs, using taxpayer money. (Yes you can mislead people and say it's TIF money from the URD...but it's taxpayer money that should be going to the city needs). Let the downtown businesses either help chase off the homeless, or hire their own private security. Enough of this enabling and policies that have failed Billings and its taxpayers.

Thank you for your time, and I'd love to hear back from council members, or city officials and discuss these issues.

Sincerely,
Rich Caporali

From: [robin ziler](#)
To: [Meling, Debi](#); [Council](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Stop lights
Date: Tuesday, December 2, 2025 4:34:31 PM



Another spot to light up is Hawthorne and wicks its a 4 way already yet at nite very dark

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone
Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: [Cole, Bill](#)
To: [Rich Caporali](#)
Cc: [Council](#); [Chris Kukulski](#); [Iffland, Kevin](#); [St. John, Rich](#); [Katy Schreiner](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Flock Cameras
Date: Tuesday, December 2, 2025 1:36:59 PM

Dear Mr. Caporali:

As you suggest, the city council will be investigating the possibility of increasing fines for traffic offenses. At a minimum, I think it's important that we make sure the fines have at least kept up with the rate of inflation over the last 20 years or so.

Concerning extra police officers downtown, those are not paid for with tax dollars, TIF or otherwise. Historically the downtown business improvement district (BID) has assessed downtown business owners a fee that is used to pay the officers. However, because it has been difficult to hire, train, and retain enough officers over the last couple years, the BID has recently hired a private security company to provide much of the extra coverage.

Bill Cole

Bill Cole, Mayor
City of Billings, Montana
coleb@billingsmt.gov
406-294-5700

From: Rich Caporali <caporali@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 2, 2025 12:49 PM
To: Council <council@billingsmt.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Flock Cameras

Dear Council and City Government

During last night's work session there was a long portion of the meeting dedicated to traffic issues we are facing as a community. Speeding and noise ARE a serious issues, and as we've seen with numerous accidents over the past couple years, life altering or life ending.

One council member brought up closing lanes or restricting traffic in certain areas to force people to slow down...which makes zero sense. What is the point of building or improving Infrastructure (which we need to do), if we are going to discourage people from using it, or restrict its usage. This is a completely moronic mindset.

Additionally, the use of cameras was brought up. While on the surface this seems to be a reasonable approach, and using Public Service Officers to watch the videos as witnesses really sounds like a good idea...I'd encourage the council to use the internet and look at the issues with flock cameras and privacy across the country. It's a system that's good in theory, but one that has been abused by local governments and one that leads to a nanny or surveillance state.

I think the best, and most reasonable solution is something I've advocated for the past five years. More cops on the streets, and harsher penalties for infractions. By this I mean raising the cost of tickets so people actually learn from their mistakes instead of repeatedly giving them lesser penalties. Maybe a warning ticket for first infraction, then a \$250 fine for the second and subsequent offenses. Sometimes the only way people learn is when you make a lesson painful.

As far as officers on the street, this is why I'm furious about the downtown sector getting three dedicated officers to deal with the homeless and drugs, using taxpayer money. (Yes you can mislead people and say it's TIF money from the URD...but it's taxpayer money that should be going to the city needs). Let the downtown businesses either help chase off the homeless, or hire their own private security. Enough of this enabling and policies that have failed Billings and its taxpayers.

Thank you for your time, and I'd love to hear back from council members, or city officials and discuss these issues.

Sincerely,
Rich Caporali