

Received 4/7/26
3:11 PM Jodi Moore, ATC

Town of Durham
Public Informational Meeting
Monday, October 20, 2025 at 7:30 p.m.
144 Pickett Lane, Community Center and Remote via Zoom
Meeting Minutes

Meeting Recording
Passcode: 2\$.Ep3rb

The purpose of this Public Informational Meeting is to present [data feedback](#) from the Speed Study conducted by Altumint Inc., and to discuss the possible use of Automated Traffic Enforcement Safety Devices (ATESD) in town.

First Selectman Rea welcomed Martin Plank and Kevin Halloran from Altumint, who completed the speed study for the town. Also in attendance was Lt. Daniel Petrusis from the Middletown Police Department.

Martin Plank presented recent speed studies showing high levels of speeding across multiple roads in the town, with daily averages ranging from 51 to 2,000 violations per day.

Lt. Petrusis spoke in favor of the cameras and explained the City of Middletown has had huge success with the three cameras that were installed. He stated most of the drivers' receiving citations are not Middletown residents. The city would like to expand the cameras into other areas.

Kevin Halloran, Altumint, noted the town only has two troopers, one on days and one on evenings. The cameras are a forceful multiplier, as the troopers can be tied up with a case for hours. Drivers will start to get into the mindset that there are speed cameras, but may not know where they are, and will slow down. The goal is to make the roads safer for everyone.

First Selectman Rea opened the meeting up to the public:

Public Comment:

Jim martinelli: asked about locations

Andrew Neggs (Zoom): asked about the locations.

Debra DeFelice: felt that if the cameras are placed on Main roads, the side streets such as Cherry Lane or Brick Lane will be filled with speeders.

Maryann O'Brien: felt there were issues with speeding on Rt 17 and Rt 77, needs enforcement in these areas. These state roads have had accidents.

Roger Kleeman: asked about the competition out there and how was Altumint chosen. Felt the speed study should have gone on Tuttle Road due to Brewster School, felt the location of the speed study on Rt 68 was worthless.

Michael Good: lives on the corner of Maiden Lane and Haddam Quarter Road, drivers fly down these roads and he is very much in support of cameras.

Maryann O'Brien: agreed that many roads in town are used at cut throughs, does not want to see more traffic on these roads. M. Plank responded that a lot of factors will go into determining the locations.

Frank DeFelice: explained he hears about speeding via the Planning and Zoning Commission. He is completely baffled as to why these locations were selected for the speed study. He would not want to see the cameras put in those areas.

Evan Martucci: questioned the finance operation of the devices. Asked how the cost of the ticket is split up. M. Plank responded that the town will need to enter into a contract with a vendor, for example Altumint and explained that this is not a revenue share it is a fixed camera cost 100% violator funded. Would depend on the contract for specifics, but a cost mutual clause.

Robert Booz: in favor of the cameras, questioned the privacy rights and retention policy for records created. M. Plank explained the citations issued have to be eliminated after the ticket is paid or adjudicated in court.

R. Booz questioned the process. M. Plank stated if the driver is going over 10mph a picture would be taken of the license plate.

Charles Iszard: questioned the right to face your accuser, which would be a camera. Spoke about cameras in Chicago and questioned if the revenue can only be used for roads. M. Plank responded that the registered owner of the vehicle is responsible and receives the ticket. There is an opportunity to contest the violation and follow the review process. State statutes only allow revenue to be used for roads improvements, traffic safety, and pedestrian safety.

Jim Martinelli: asked who determines where the cameras go. M. Plank responded that the vendor will work with the town to send locations to DOT for approval. DOT has a lot of criteria they use to determine if a location is eligible.

Leslie Bulion: explained there are many other towns who have adopted speed cameras and we are able see their experiences. The state statute has a lot of requirements as well. CT requires fair and equitable and requires input from the community. Explained that the Complete Streets Committee asked for public input and 90% of the 300 respondents identified that speeding is an issue. Hope to see the town move forward with this.

Dave Stintson: explained he lives on Main St, across from Strong School, and is shocked to see how fast people drive. He has observed drivers going 20mph over the speed limit. There have been two deaths in front of his home. Noted the noise from the speeding is horrible. Felt the speed limit should be reduced in this area. Asked the town to please take this forward. First Selectman Rea noted Complete Streets to looking to improve safety in this area as well.

Becky Anderson: felt that drivers trying to get around the speed cameras is human nature. Alternate roads can be a location for law enforcement to go speeding.

Andy Meiman: spoke in support of the speed cameras. Maple Avenue has been a constant problem for cut throughs, wondered if there was any other engineering ideas such as speed bumps or rumble strips. First Selectman Rea responded that Maple Avenue has received a lot of attention from the Resident State Troopers who have conducted speed enforcement and the town has received a lot of positive feedback. Town engineers were reluctant to sign off on speed bumps or humps. Line of sight issues in this area were also improved.

Sue Michael: has been driving Rt 68 for 20+ years and has been passed illegally on Maple Avenue multiple times. She spoke in favor of the cameras being installed around town. If someone is speeding they are breaking the law and she expressed the need for safer roads.

Rick Parmelee: signage for the cameras need to be visible. Noted a lot of outside traffic that cuts through town. Questioned the cost. M. Plank responded this is 100% violator funded

Wyatt Pedersen: questioned the financing of the contract and the feedback/stats received from other towns. M. Plank responded it is a zero fixed cost per camera.

Lt. Petruilis explained the town had public forums after the speed cameras were installed in town and residents have complained on these parallel roads that drivers are going too slow. Speeding is huge factor and Middletown has seen a double digit reduction.

K. Halloran explained that the town must report 18 months from the installation of the cameras, how many violations were given, was there a decrease in traffic crashes, etc.

Eileen Buckheit: noted there are a lot of speeders on Johnson Lane, it is used at cut through. Cannot walk her dog in this area, instead drive to Allyn Brook/Main Street/Brick Lane area, which is also an intimidating area to walk. Felt this is a quality of life issue. Having revenue coming back to town for more sidewalks and more places for residents to walk is a good thing and expressed her support for rapid flashing beacons.

Simone Howe: lives on Main Street, noted speeders on Maple Avenue. She wants to see drivers driving the speed limit in Durham.

John Szewczyk: questioned the appeal process, how to go about collected unpaid citations, amount being appealed in Middletown, Procurement Policy, signage on Main St previously run over. Lt. Petruilis explained that the City of Middletown sends a citation in the mail with a QR code, there is a lot a tablet at the City Hall and Police Dept to pay at. Can also be paid on a smart phone. Anyone who receives a citation can log in and refute the violation. The appeal hearings meet a few times a month.

First Selectman Rea explained the Board of Selectmen needs to propose an ordinance and hold a Public Hearing for more feedback. Thanked everyone for their comments.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,
Jaclyn Lehet