Board of Selectmen
Municipal Office Complex
Meeting Rooms 1 & 2
October 24, 2025
Special Meeting Minutes

Selectmen Present: I. Haines; T. Bourgoin; E Dill
Also Present: E. Chamberlain; S. Denya; T. Gelston; M. Pierson; L. Zemienieski and other members of the public

1. First Selectman Haines called the Board of Selectmen's meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and the attendees said the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Automated Traffic Enforcement Safety Devices (ATESD) Discussion of Ordinance and Public Hearing: Ms. Haines noted that she was going to clarify why this meeting was being called. She explained that she meant to have this item included on the agenda for the October 22 special meeting, but due to posting requirements it was too late to include. She would like to move the discussion on this program further down the process. The next step, as mentioned in the last Selectmen's meeting, is to determine, as a board, the last piece of the drafted ordinance which is the threshold of how much over the speed limit should be allowed before a ticket might be issued and push the draft ordinance to a public hearing. She noted that the board was not voting on the draft ordinance or the program at all. There were a lot of questions regarding the program, and the Selectmen have been researching this for at least a year. There are many towns and cities looking into this program. She commented that she receives calls, letters and emails every day from residents who are very upset about the speeds that people are traveling in our town. She noted that we now have a fully staffed police department, however, there are 120 miles of road in town and residents will slow down at a speed indicator, when they see a cop and a radar but as soon as they go beyond that they are going to keep speeding. She added that this is a problem that the board will never fully solve, however, after talking to a number of other users this program seems to change behavior and that is what our goal is. There is also an element of income that is involved in this that we can use to do more traffic devices, more police officers, more road improvements, more road markings and better sidewalks. She noted that it is her opinion that we need to bring this to the public so they can learn about it. She added that due to misinformation, people were under the impression that the board was voting on this program today. The only thing being voted on is to push this to a public hearing.

   Ms Bourgoin noted that she assumes that by misinformation Ms. Haines is referring to Ms. Bourgoin's post. She noted that her post was very clear that her objection was to the process and not the device itself. She added as Ms. Haines pointed out herself, the board has never voted on this. She noted that she had concerns about how this was going to be enforced. She continued, like Ms. Haines just said, people will slow down when they see the police officer and when they see the posting, but they are going to keep speeding in other zones in town. These devices will not help to address this as they cannot be moved, and they have to be legally noticed. She has questions on efficiency and effectiveness, and the board has never

addressed the question of enforcement. Ms. Bourgoin stated her biggest concern right now was that the board had the gentleman from the Dacra Tech come to the last Board of Selectmen meeting and that since discussing this from January to now the program has changed from purchasing the camera for $23,000 and charging administrative fees to leasing the camera for $2,000 per month and charging administrative fees and now they have completely changed their structure and plan to only charge the administrative fees and only if the town received the money from the infraction in the first place. On face value this sounds great, but she would like a little more time to look at this because it sounds too great. She does not see how a company can go from a model of making $24,000 a year on leasing equipment to taking a $13.50 per infraction fee and only if they actually generate any money in the first place. She noted the money must come from someplace. She added this seems very hasty to her and she would like to know how the company came to make this decision, how it works for them, where this money is going and what is in it for them. She has serious concerns regarding this program, and not the fact that we need to reduce speeding in town. She feels there are other options. She suggested possibly increasing police patrols. She added that she does not feel this program has been thoroughly vetted and does not see what the rush is. Why not take the time to look into it further.

Mr. Dill added that when this was first presented, he was in favor of it and thought it was a great idea then it came down to a decision on money since this was not budgeted. He also had a concern with enforcement. He noted that as far as he was concerned the last presentation from Dacra Tech addressed all of his concerns regarding affordability. He thought their new structure was a smart business model on their part. He explained that he felt they probably realized that the towns were not biting at the $24,000 lease for one non-moveable camera. Now towns can order multiple cameras and put them on a number of roads because they are only charged the administrative fees. Dacra Tech will be making more money on the fees from multiple cameras. He felt that enforcement was always going to be an issue, and we would probably end up with 80-90% compliance similar to what the Town of Washington reported. He noted that he doesn't know if this is practical on our smaller roads, side roads and dead ends. He continued that this does have support from the Police Department. He added that our attorney is reviewing the contract, and we will see what he comes back with.

Mr. Dill noted the last piece of the drafted ordinance is to determine the threshold of how much over the speed limit should be allowed before a ticket might be issued and he noted that he has been pretty clear that he felt that number should be 15 miles over the posted speed limit.

Ms. Haines noted that she agreed with 15 miles over the posted speed limit. She added that we can start there and when we have the public hearing we can hear from the public on their thoughts. She noted that for the public hearing she would like to bring in Brandan Knox from Dacra Tech to answer questions from our residents.

Ms Bourgoin added that her general objection is regarding the rush to move this to a public hearing. Ms Haines asked what was rushed. Ms. Bourgoin responded that we do not have any feedback from our attorney on the contract as he hasn't looked at it yet. Mr. Haines

responded that we will have the attorney's response shortly and if they say this is not a good program we will cancel the public hearing. Ms. Bourgoin added that we still have not addressed the enforcement issues, the appeal process and the privacy concerns. Ms. Haines asked Ms. Bourgoin if she was opposed to sending it to the public and having the public ask questions and discuss it. Ms. Bourgoin responded no but felt that before it was brought to the public, the board should vet those items first and perform their due diligence before bringing it to the public. She does not feel that the board's job is complete. Ms. Haines responded that she felt the board has done a lot of vetting on this subject, and that we take what is received from the attorney and have Brandon Knox at the public hearing to answer any questions regarding the program, his company and their business model and move forward. She added that she and the board have been working on this for a year and if there is any rush on this project it is to get the public's input. After the public hearing the board will be under new administration, and they can decide whether or not to move forward with the program. Ms. Haines stated that she would like to ask her board to move the ordinance forward to a public hearing on November 5th from 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm which is prior to the scheduled Town Meeting.

Motion made by Mr. Dill, seconded by Ms. Haines, to approve moving the Automated Traffic Enforcement Safety Device Ordinance to a Public Hearing on November 5, 2025 from 6:00pm to 8:00pm. Ms. Bourgoin noted that she is not opposed to sending this to the public but will be abstaining from the vote. The motion passed by a majority of ayes.

Ms. Haines noted that due to the misinformation regarding this topic she will be writing something for the newspaper that gives an overview of the project and will review it with the board to see if there were any details that were misrepresented. Ms. Bourgoin noted that would be great as long as the article included the fact that the only times the board voted on this the vote was no.

Ms. Zemienieski requested the board review the public hearing notice for any changes before it is published. The board had no changes. She also confirmed for the draft ordinance that the speed limit threshold of how much over the speed limit should be allowed before a ticket might be issued should be 15 miles over the posted speed limit and that the appeal board would be the Board of Selectmen. The board was in agreement.

3. Adjournment: There being no additional business to discuss, a motion was made by Mr. Dill, seconded by Ms. Bourgoin, to adjourn the meeting at 9:21 a.m. .

Recorded

Respectfully submitted,
Erik Dill, Secretary