

Received 4/7/26
1:40 PM Jodi Moore, ATC

Town of Durham
Public Hearing
Monday, Monday March 2, 2026, at 7:30 p.m.
Durham Community Center, 144 Pickett Lane, and Remote via Zoom

[Public Hearing Recording](#)

Passcode: vn5fL\$5?

The purpose of this public hearing is to present information, discuss and provide an opportunity for public comments on the following: Proposed Ordinance Establishing the Use of Automated Traffic Enforcement Safety Devices (ATESD)

First Selectman Rea explained the town has completed two traffic studies, the information is available on the town website. If the ordinance passes, the town still need approval from Department of Transportation on locations for the cameras. These locations have not been determined as of this date.

Public Comment:

Bob Booz, Banta Lane: generally, in favor of the cameras. At the last meeting the vendor in attendance stated that images are only captured in cases of violation and enforcement. B. Booz felt that nothing in this ordinance pertains to this, even in section about privacy. He recommended some specific language be added that that images can only be captured for violation and that it is not a monitoring device.

Deb DeFelice, Cherry Lane: also generally in favor. Was concerned about the potential locations because it could cause cars to avoid the cameras and go down side-streets instead, like hers. Felt it makes side streets less safe. Proposed ordinance only allows residents who receive tickets in the mail 10 days to respond or they are automatically guilty, but the staff responsible for reviewing the violations has 30-days. Noted that a resident could be on vacation or away and that the 10-days should be increased to 30-days at least. She noted the legal defenses do not include if a resident is wrongly identified and issued a violation. Felt \$15 to pay online was too high.

Joe Pasqual: generally opposed to the proposed ordinance. Understood the safety aspect, but felt Durham is a small community and should be using the Resident State Troopers to target these specific areas where speeding is happening. Residents will lose the one on one interaction with officers. If drivers have kids who speed and get tickets, their insurance policy will go through the roof. Did not feel it was wise for our town to approve this ordinance. Also, noted the section that speaks about violations and enforcement process is an authorized a town employee, he did not think that's a good idea as there is the potential for favoritism. All decisions would need to be documented. Felt the most concerning part of the ordinance was in section **Definitions** regarding personnel identifiable information such as name, address, bank account number, credit card number etc. Felt this was illegal.

Roger Kleeman, Tuttle Road: asked where the town is thinking about putting the cameras. Town roads should be looked at, not just Rt 17 or Rt 68. Asked about the cameras in states that are being shut down. What will this cost the town. First Selectman Rea responded the cameras that are being shut down in some areas are Flock Cameras, not speed cameras. He noted there will be a cost for labor.

Chuck Stengel, Buckboard Road: asked for further explanation of Section 6. First Selectman Rea explained this is statute driven but is something the state legislature could look into in the future.

Rick Parmelee, Parmelee Hill Rd: if someone stole his car or he was away on vacation, he would not make the 10-day limit to respond to a violation.

Jim Rossi, Higganum Road: was somewhat in favor but does not like DOT's involvement. Has worked with DOT in the past with town business and was not impressed. This feels like a money grab shielded behind Public Safety.

Susan Good, Haddam Quarter Road: has seen a lot of drivers passing buses, traffic issues and speeders coming through town. If this slows drivers down, then it is a great thing.

Frank DeFelice, Cherry Lane: generally opposed to this ordinance. At the first public informational session, it was overwhelmingly said that residents should decide where the camera locations should be. He felt that the roads parallel to where the cameras go will see a dramatic increase in speed,

cars, etc. Noted that when Main St is blocked, Cherry Lane becomes a race way. Also, there is no mechanism in place for speed limit. Felt this is too important to go through at a Town Meeting and should go to a referendum instead. Spoke about the following, can the town get out of a contract with a vendor, felt no one should be revealing bank debit or credit card information, \$15 charge for a credit card, whose responsible when the vendor or town does not destroy the personal identifiable information, who will get sued if our information is compromised.

Corey Pedersen, Parsons Lane: felt this was a money grab more than for public safety. The town has two Resident State Troopers who could be focusing on patrolling these streets more than cameras. Cameras have a problem identifying the face of a driver and are now wrongfully accusing drivers. First Selectman Rea responded that the cameras do not take pictures of the drivers, they take pictures of the license plate and the registered owner of the vehicle receives the violation. Spoke about public surveillance being challenged in court for privacy reasons, unreasonable search and seizure against the 4th amendment. If the ticket gets thrown out by a teen, your registration and taxes could be held liable. With a ticket from an officer, he can bring his accuser to court, with a camera that's not the case. Spoke about violations to the 5th and 14th amendments.

Frances McNulty, Salted Lane: echo comments of those opposed. Spoke about data breaches, class action lawsuits, happen all the time. Two years ago residents requested funds for an additional trooper and did not get approved. Any funds to be used towards cameras should go towards funding another trooper. Citizens are constantly being exposed and taped and this is just opening up another box.

Sue Michael, Dunn Hill Road: in support of the ordinance, as a walker and a bike she felt drivers are crazy and something needs to be done. Two troopers can't be on every road. If you are driving and speeding you should be ticketed.

Leslie Bulion, Green Lane: in favor of this ordinance. Complete Streets started with a survey with feedback from the community and huge problem was road safety, not safe for pedestrians, cyclers or drivers. The troopers cannot be everywhere at once and there are speeders on Main Roads and back roads. The town has the crash data to prove it, with injuries and deaths. Understood the interaction with a trooper is important, but many drivers do not care until they get caught. Other towns data shows that citations are mainly given to those who do not live in the town where the cameras are located. Spoke about a change in behavior and information regarding personal identification is destroyed within 30-days.

Alan Poole, Middlefield resident: spoke in favor of the ordinance, explained he was hit by a distracted driver. Felt drivers drive slower in Middletown because of the speed cameras there.

Lucy Meigs: in favor of the proposed ordinance. Felt speeding is a big issue in town. Felt the personal information was not stored long term, but would be an issue if it was.

Anthony Kerns: spoke in favor of the cameras, noticed a large volume of cars speeding on Maiden Lane and Haddam Quarter, especially after Covid. Also spoke in favor of speed bumps. A lot of teen drivers and workers speeding during rush hour. Asked where the cameras will be located.

First Selectman Rea explained that the town has not entered into a contract with a vendor yet, but Martin Plank of Altumint has helped conduct speed studies for the town and was present to answer questions. M. Plank noted the \$15 fee in the proposed ordinance is a processing credit card fee. He further explained that if the ordinance passed, the town would choose their locations for cameras and are required to submit a traffic study plan to be approved by DOT. First Selectman Rea added that this is similar to the town seeking approval from DOT for speed limits, school zones, etc.

It was further explained that these violations are civil penalties and will not affect drivers insurance or driving record. Regarding personal information, if a violation is paid by credit card, the vendor by law is required to get rid of it. Discussion on the speed study completed and that other towns have seen a 90% reduction in speeders.

Cheryl Salva, Town House Road: felt she has seen speed cameras in other towns and drivers only slow down where the cameras are located and speed up after. Felt drivers avoid these locations or learn where they are, thus making the cameras ineffective.

Joseph: felt a lot of good points about privacy concerns were made. Felt a lot of the speeders in town are residents and speeding is an epidemic. Something needs to be done, noted the resident who lives on Green Lane doing 140mph on back roads in town.

M. Plank explained violations go through quality assurance, after it is verified by the vendor it goes to the town employee for review before being mailed out.

Rob: noted at the last Public Hearing the Captain from the Middletown Police Department stated that speeding through the whole city has reduced. Durham could put a trooper on the back roads near the locations of these cameras as well.

J. Pasquale: stated that the City of Middletown has a Police Department, Durham has two troopers. First Selectman Rea explained that the speed study was conducted on all the state roads and town roads including; Maiden Lane, Maple Ave, Pent Road.

R. Kleeman: why is a violation given out for speeding over 10mph, why not bring it lower. M. Plank responded state statute only allows for towns to issue violations for speeding 10mph or over the posted speed limit.

Ruban: what is the cost and benefit for the town. First Selectman Rea responded he has discussed with numerous vendors/companies over the past year. Some companies have changed their business models to have the cameras, mailers, etc. paid for by the violations. The cost of the cameras are low and the revenue first comes back to the town. There is a cost neutrality in the contract clause for some companies. The goal is to change behavior and the companies can provide the data and analysis on this. The town will need to hire part-time staff to be the second review the tickets after the vendor checks the basic information. Vendor contracts have 30-60 day cancellation notice but no fee to cancel.

J. Pasquale asked what the breakdown of the ticket is. M. Plank responded that the vendor has a fixed fee per camera and anything remaining goes back to the town. The vendor is never paid per violation.

C. Pedersen: asked for specific numbers from the vendor. M. Plank responded that once the town enters into a contract with his company or another, that information is available and transparent.

Anthony: asked about the physical speed deterrents. Agreed that cameras are only effective in those targeted areas.

C. Salva: felt the information about the vendor cost sounds vague and wants a better example before making a decision. Felt this was a money grab situation and the town should have a contract in place, understand where the money goes, before getting town meeting approval. First Selectman Rea explained the town cannot enter into a contract with a vendor until the proposed ordinance passes.

A. Vizard: wondered why the town doesn't hire another trooper.

The Board of Selectmen thanked everyone for their comments and will discuss follow-up steps at their next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jaclyn Lehet