

# Greenwich School Zone Safety Presentation

- This presentation was created with the goal of protecting our children
- It's about the principle of the matter - speed cameras were rolled out prematurely
- This has nothing to do with avoiding a one-off ticket or fine
- This isn't simply one missing sign or mistake or loophole – This is about a widespread safety failure
- We need to address and fix systemic issues that are putting our children at risk
- Greenwich was repeatedly warned and instructed multiple times and failed to take corrective action
- The “goals” and “plans” were admirable in most (but not all) respects
- The implementation, oversight and attention to detail is woefully lacking by Blue Line Solutions
- I guarantee there are mistakes in this presentation – Try not to lose sight of the bigger picture
- **Let the public know which rules to follow and they will comply**
- **But the public cannot be expected to comply with rules that haven't been publicized or posted correctly**
- The rules of evidence have been relaxed by design (“shall not be strictly applied”) in the statutes (CGS 7-152c) for this purpose



February 2026

# Table of Contents

Overview / Executive Summary	3
Operating / Enforcement Times & Speed Limits	11
Compliance Issues (Sign Types, Locations, Visibility, Placement)	21
Examples of Other Municipalities ATESD Plans	43
MUTCD Requirements	50
When Children Are Present Standard	63
Inadequate Public Notice	68
Public Feedback / Criticism	73
Appendix	77
Blue Line Due Diligence	96
Subsequent Events – Post Publication Update	103

# Overview / Executive Summary

*Protecting Our Children Is A Noble Cause – 218 children and 1,125 people of all ages were killed over the last decade in school-transportation-related crashes (although overwhelmingly not in school zones nor caused by speeding)*



## School Zone Cameras

According to [NHTSA statistics](#), between 2011 and 2020, 218 school-age children (ages 18 and younger) died in school transportation-related crashes; 44 were occupants of school transportation vehicles, 83 were occupants of other vehicles, 85 were pedestrians, 5 were bicyclists and 1 was an “other” nonoccupant. Zooming out to consider all roadway users, not just school-age children, between 2011 and 2020 there were 1,009 fatal school-transportation-related crashes, and 1,125 people of all ages were killed in those crashes—an average of 113 fatalities per year.

## Speed Cameras

According to [NHTSA](#), 11,258 crashes or 29% of all motor vehicle fatalities occurred in speed-related crashes in 2020.

[2011–2020 Data: School-Transportation-Related Crashes](#)

Despite Requirement, Not One Of These Regulatory / Warning Signs Appear Eastbound on East Putnam Avenue

# Standard Highway Signs - 2024 Edition

## Including: Standard Alphabets, Pavement Markings and Traffic Signals


S1-1  
2024 Edition



S4-5  
REDUCED SCHOOL SPEED LIMIT AHEAD


\* See page 7-6 for arrow design.  
\*\* Optically space numerals about centerline.

S4-5  
2024 Edition



S4-5a  
REDUCED SCHOOL SPEED LIMIT AHEAD

S4-5a  
2024 Edition



S1-1  
SCHOOL



2024 SHS Releases 1-4 - Regulatory, Warning, Temporary Traffic Control, and School Signs  
Combined Releases 1-4 (3/12/2025) and (7/3/2025)

**Greenwich has a duty to invalidate ALL citations given at the East Putnam ATESD and refund ALL citations already paid, given the magnitude of the deficiencies to regulatory and warning sign compliance and in the interest of justice – The site fails to comply with its ATESD proposal and thus cannot be operated or enforced**

From Both Approaches Highlighted With A Red Arrow, There is NO Visible Warning or Regulatory School Zone or Speed Limit Sign whatsoever

If Approaching From Either Red Arrow, Where Does The School Zone End? Where Does It Begin Again? There Are 4 “End School Zone” Signs And NONE Of The Required “Begin School Zone” Signs

GREENWICH HIGH SCHOOL  
SCHOOL PHOTO SPEED ENFORCEMENT FOR E PUTNAM AVENUE

02 If a reduced school speed limit zone has been established, a School (S1-1) sign shall be installed in advance (see Table 2C-3 for advance placement guidelines) of the first School Speed Limit sign assembly or S5-1 sign that is encountered in each direction as traffic approaches the reduced school speed limit zone (see Figures 7B-2 and 7B-4). **FAIL...**

School Signs And Speed Signs Need To Be In The School Zone Per MUTCD

Wrong Place – Wrong Signs - Need To Be Visible, FYG, Placed Beyond Intersection, Nearer School Zone And Across From End School Zone – There are not proper “advanced warning signs”

New Sign – But Never Removed The Old Signs

Oops. It Isn't The End Either

Wrong – It Isn't The End

Obstructed By Tree

Wrong Place – Wrong Signs - Need To Be Visible, FYG, Placed Beyond Intersection, Nearer School Zone And Across From End School Zone

"In particular, speed limit signs shall be located as near as practicable to where the school speed zone begins in each direction" – They are NOWHERE near the beginning/end of the school zones – And NOWHERE in between either

All Speed Signs And School Zone Signs Were Removed In This Entire 2,900 Foot Stretch, >0.5 miles

#4 Cannot Be Seen From Old Church Approach


#5 Missing (Exists In Plan, But Hasn't Been Here In Years)

Removed

Guidance: 17 Additional Speed Limit signs should be installed beyond interchanges and major intersections and at other locations where it is necessary to remind road users of the speed limit that is applicable.

(d) In no event shall a municipality use, install or operate an automated traffic enforcement safety device unless such use, installation or operation complies with the provisions of a plan approved by the Department of Transportation and the approval of such plan is effective.


Standard: **FAIL...**  
04 If a school zone has been designated under State or local statute, a School (S1-1) sign (see Figure 7B-1) shall be installed to identify the beginning point(s) of the designated school zone (see Figure 7B-2).





- I am here because injustice is here – *Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere* - MLK
- I wasn't driving and submitted an affidavit stating that I wasn't driving – At the very least, the cameras should also photograph the driver for accountability
- I have proof that I was nowhere near the scene at the time (shown below) – other evidence available upon request
- I haven't been pulled over for speeding in 15+ years, yet got 3 notices from an ATESD in Greenwich (I do not live or work in Greenwich)
- I've owned six cars over the last two months for business – A variety of people drive them (landscapers, caretakers, babysitters, spouse, etc.)
- If you show me a photo of the driver I will identify them, but I don't want to speculate absent evidence - I don't track drivers
- On days that I drive my daughter to school I pass by no fewer than 10 (ten) separate speed cameras twice a day – Seems excessive

- Slow Down – First ask yourself why there isn't broad compliance (17,000 violations makes that obvious) – Ask drivers why they didn't comply – Let's not rush to speed cameras and fines without identifying and fixing the problem – That needs to be ironed out first
- If your goal is to limit speeding and protect children, then put the right signs up in the right places and make them visible from all approaches so that drivers can obey them
- If your goal is to grab money, keep playing games and failing to post the required signs or adequately inform the public you will be putting our children at risk
- I know which choice I would make if I were in your position
- Throw in some school crosswalk signs while you're at it to highlight the school zone (there are none currently on East Putnam)
- I'm not a traffic engineer – I certainly may have made errors interpreting the guidelines. But common sense dictates you need at least one single visible sign to enforce a school zone speed limit. There isn't a single school/speed sign on the entire approach to GHS from GCDS



*"An unjust law is no law at all" – St. Augustine*

**Site #10- Roadway Images: Greenwich High School (E. Putnam Ave)**

**GREENWICH HIGH SCHOOL  
SCHOOL PHOTO SPEED ENFORCEMENT FOR E PUTNAM AVENUE**

**02** If a reduced school speed limit zone has been established, a School (S1-1) sign shall be installed in advance (see Table 2C-3 for advance placement guidelines) of the first School Speed Limit sign assembly or S5-1 sign that is encountered in each direction as traffic approaches the reduced school speed limit zone (see Figures 7B-2 and 7B-4).

**←The East Putnam Approaches Are Missing This Sign Combination Other Greenwich Zones Have It And So Does Nearly Every Other Town**

**Because there is an End School Zone From This Approach There Should Be Another Sign Here**

**MISSING**


If applicable, for side street(s), the sign below will be used to inform motorists entering an ATESD monitored school zone.

**MISSING**

**Guidance:**  
The beginning point of a reduced school speed limit zone should be at least 200 feet in advance of the school grounds or a school crossing; however, this 200-foot distance should be increased if the reduced school speed limit is 30 mph or higher. The maximum beginning point of a reduced school speed limit zone should not be greater than 500 feet in advance of the school grounds or a school crossing.

**School Crossing And School Grounds Well Beyond 500 Feet Away**

*The flashing speed limit sign is “perpendicular” to Old Church road and impossible to see – Actual view/photo with “blinders” shown below:*



**Proposed School Signage**

- #1 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 257' west of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- #6 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 357' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- #11 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 200' east of the centerline of Hillside Road.
- #16 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 117' west of the centerline of Indian Field Road.
- #17 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 107' north of the stop bar along Old Church Road.
- #18 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 107' south of the stop bar along Overbrook Drive.
- #19 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 100' south of the stop bar along W Brother Drive.
- #20 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 100' south of the stop bar along Woodside Drive.
- #21 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 100' north of the stop bar along Hillside Road.
- #22 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 100' north of the stop bar along Brookridge Drive.
- #2 Install a new 30 mph Speed Limit sign approx 225' west of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- #15 Existing 30 mph Speed Limit sign located approx 300' east of the centerline of Brookridge Drive.
- #3 Install a School Zone Ahead Flies Doubled sign approx 120' west of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- #13 Install a School Zone Ahead Flies Doubled sign approx 155' east of the centerline of Brookridge Drive.
- #4 Existing S5-1 Flashing School Speed assembly approx 50' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- #12 Install an R10-19p sign below the existing S5-1 Flashing School Speed assembly approx 110' east of the centerline of Brookridge Drive.
- #7 Install a new AC Power Camera approx 70' east of the centerline of Overbrook Drive (250' enforcement zone).
- #10 Install a new AC Power Camera approx 115' west of the centerline of Hillside Road (250' enforcement zone).
- #8 Existing S5-2 End School Zone sign located approx 55' east of the centerline of Woodside Drive.
- #9 Install a new S5-2 End School Zone sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- #14 Existing S1-1 School Sign is located approx 220' east of the centerline of Brookridge Drive.

**The Speed Limit Sign And Flashing Lights Can Not Be Seen From All Approaches, Namely Old Church Road and Hillside – It is Also Not As Close As Practicable To The Start Of The School Zone – It is not visible or conspicuous – The flashing lights have “blinders” on the side to prevent anyone from Old Church Road from knowing whether or not they are flashing**

WEST	02
WEST	
WEST	
WEST	
WEST	

WEST	WEST	WEST	WEST	WEST
02				
6/30/2025				
GREENWICH SCHOOL DISTRICT HILLSIDE ROAD ENWICH, CT				
PUTNAM AVENUE				

GREENWICH

**Guidance:**

- 17 Additional Speed Limit signs should be installed beyond interchanges and major intersections and at other locations where it is necessary to remind road users of the speed limit that is applicable. **FAIL...**

**Site #10- Roadway Images: Greenwich High School (E. Putnam Ave)**



Speed limit signs were removed from the school zone rather than being replaced with accurate signs...

Now there are no speed limit signs within the entire school zone – that’s a long length of road and against guidance

**GREENWICH HIGH SCHOOL  
SCHOOL PHOTO SPEED ENFORCEMENT FOR E PUTNAM AVENUE**



There are NO "advanced warning signs" for the school zone from OCR

There are ZERO speed limit signs or school zone signs along this entire 0.54 mile school zone

During the reviews, it was noted that there are currently posted speed limit signs within the proposed school zone limits on East Elm Street, Hillside Road, Milbank Avenue, and Hamilton Avenue. The existing speed limit signs will require relocation out of the school speed limit zone. It was also observed that the existing School Warning signs are not in compliance with the latest color standards contained in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and should be updated in conjunction with the School Zone speed limit sign installations.

Greenwich received MULTIPLE warnings from CT DOT / OSTA that the signs were not in compliance and failed to take corrective action – This opens up liability

**FAIL...**

When a school zone extends beyond half a mile, additional speed limit signs should be installed to inform drivers of the reduced speed limit. These signs should be placed at or as near as practical to the point where the reduced speed limit zone begins. The maximum beginning point of a reduced school speed limit zone should not be greater than 500 feet in advance of the school grounds or a school crossing. The beginning point of a reduced school speed limit zone should be at least 200 feet in advance of the school grounds or a school crossing; however, this 200-foot distance should be increased if the reduced school speed limit is 30 mph or higher.

During the reviews, it was noted that there are currently posted speed limit signs within the proposed school zone limits. The existing speed limit signs will require relocation out of the school speed limit zone. It was also observed that the existing School Warning signs are not in compliance with the latest color standards contained in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and should be updated in conjunction with the School Zone speed limit sign installations.

**Proposed School Signage**

- #1 Install an R10-11 School Zone Ahead sign approx 100' west of the centerline of Elm Street.
- #2 Install a new 30 mph Speed Limit sign approx 220' west of the centerline of Oak Church Road.
- #3 Install a School Zone Ahead Flashed Doublet sign approx 120' west of the centerline of Oak Church Road.
- #4 Existing 55-1 Flashing School Speed assembly approx 50' east of the centerline of Oak Church Road.
- #5 Existing 51-1 School sign to be located approx 350' east of the centerline of Oak Church Road.
- #6 Existing 30 mph Speed Limit sign located approx 300' east of the centerline of Brookledge Drive.
- #7 Existing 30 mph Speed Limit sign located approx 100' south of the stop bar along W Brother Drive.
- #8 Existing 30 mph Speed Limit sign located approx 100' south of the stop bar along Woodside Drive.
- #9 Existing 30 mph Speed Limit sign located approx 100' north of the stop bar along Hillside Road.
- #10 Existing 30 mph Speed Limit sign located approx 100' north of the stop bar along Brookledge Drive.
- #11 Existing 30 mph Speed Limit sign located approx 100' north of the stop bar along Brookledge Drive.
- #12 Install an R10-11 Photo Enforced sign approx 100' south of the stop bar along Woodside Drive.
- #13 Install a School Zone Ahead Flashed Doublet sign approx 160' east of the centerline of Brookledge Drive.
- #14 Existing 51-1 School Sign to be located approx 220' east of the centerline of Brookledge Drive.



**Section 2B.25 Higher Fines Signs and Plaque (R2-6P, R2-10, and R2-11)**

**Standard:**

01 Except as provided in Paragraph 3 of this Section, if increased fines are imposed for traffic violations within a designated zone of a roadway, a BEGIN HIGHER FINES ZONE (R2-10) sign (see Figure 2B-3) or a FINES HIGHER (R2-6P) plaque (see Figure 2B-3) shall be used to provide notice to road users.

02 If an R2-10 sign or an R2-6P plaque is posted to provide notice of increased fines for traffic violations, an END HIGHER FINES ZONE (R2-11) sign (see Figure 2B-3) shall be installed at the downstream end of the zone to provide notice to road users of the termination of the increased fines zone.

**Option:**

03 The BEGIN HIGHER FINES ZONE (R2-10) sign or FINES HIGHER (R2-6P) plaque may be omitted where the higher fines zone is established by nature.

**Guidance:**

04 The BEGIN HIGHER FINES ZONE sign or FINES HIGHER plaque should be located at the beginning of the temporary traffic control zone, school zone, or other applicable designated zone and just beyond any interchanges, major intersections, or other major traffic generators. **FAIL.**

**Site #10- Roadway Images: Greenwich High School (E. Putnam Ave)**

GREENWICH HIGH SCHOOL  
SCHOOL PHOTO SPEED ENFORCEMENT FOR E PUTNAM AVENUE

**Proposed School Signage**

<p>#1 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 325' west of the centerline of Oak Church Road.</p> <p>#6 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 500' east of the centerline of Oak Church Road.</p> <p>#11 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 200' east of the centerline of Hillside Road.</p> <p>#16 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 15' west of the centerline of Brookside Drive.</p> <p>#17 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 100' north of the stop bar along Oak Church Road.</p> <p>#18 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 100' south of the stop bar along Overbrook Drive.</p> <p>#19 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 100' south of the stop bar along Brookside Drive.</p> <p>#21 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 100' north of the stop bar along Hillside Road.</p> <p>#22 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 100' north of the stop bar along Brookside Drive.</p>		<p>#4 Excluding 50-1 Flashing School Speed assembly approx 50' east of the centerline of Oak Church Road.</p> <p>#12 Install an R10-18 sign below the existing 50-1 Flashing School Speed assembly approx 110' east of the centerline of Brookside Drive.</p>	<p>#5 Excluding 5-1 School Sign to be located approx 350' east of the centerline of Oak Church Road.</p> <p>#14 Excluding 5-1 School Sign to be located approx 220' east of the centerline of Brookside Drive.</p>	<p>#8 Excluding 5-2 End School Zone sign to be located approx 55' east of the centerline of Brookside Drive.</p> <p>#9 Install a new 5-2 End School Zone sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Oak Church Road.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

\* School Zone to be enforced when flashing. Normal speed to be enforced all other times.  
\* Lateral distance for any sign or posts should be a min of 2' from the back of curb or 12' from edge of pavement.

A major intersection is a significant junction where two or more major roads meet, often controlled by traffic signals or roundabouts, and plays a crucial role in traffic management and urban planning.

Old Church Road & East Putnam is a major intersection and Higher Fines / Fines Doubled / Speed Limit Signs Need to go on the east side of the intersection as well as near each of the End School Zone markers

Major intersection. - in urban areas means an intersection that is controlled by traffic control signals

You could even argue the Overbrook & Hillside intersections w/ E. Putnam are major intersection given they have Traffic Control Signals

# Operating / Enforcement Times & Speed Limits

**Speed Limit Plans Inconsistent** - limits shown at: 20mph or 25mph or 30mph or 35mph?  
 Different documents/signs show wild variation: 85<sup>th</sup> percentile of 38mph or 40mph or 42mph?  
 Same issues at East Putnam (High School) and North Street – **Conflicting speed limits**

**Conflicting time periods** shown as well – S: 7:45-8:45? 7:30-8:30? 7:00-8:00? 7:15-8:15?  
 Different documents and signs show each of these: E: 1:45-2:45? 2:40-3:40? 3:00-4:00? 2:00-4:00?  
 Same issues at East Putnam (High School) and North Street – **Conflicting operating times**



Same HS Location: From Application --- From Google Maps --- From Drive By  
 So **which time do we use?** At least Hillside HAS a sign... East Putnam does not

This is utterly confusing – **What is the speed limit?** 20? 25? 30? 35? 40?  
 What is the statutory 85<sup>th</sup> percentile? 38? 40? 42?

Is the speed limit in effect at the HS “when flashing” or the time on the sign or the time in the application (or the second alternate time in the application) or the time on Google or the direction from the Police Department? They are ALL different.

The **85th percentile speed** on roads implies that the speed at or below which 85% of drivers operate under free-flow conditions is a key factor in determining safe speed limits. It suggests that most drivers perceive their speed to be safe and reasonable, and that speed limits set above or below this speed can create unsafe conditions due to speed differential. The 85th percentile speed is used by many states and cities for establishing regulatory speed zones, and it is based on the theory

Speed Limit	35 mph
Average Speed	34 mph
50 <sup>th</sup> Percentile Speed	35 mph
85 <sup>th</sup> Percentile Speed	42 mph
Max Speed	103 mph

GREENWICH H.S. –  
 25 MPH  
 7:00 – 8:00 a.m.  
 1:45 – 2:45 p.m.  
 School Days  
 When Flashing  
*From TIR*

↑ ? ↓

Times: (7:45 AM - 8:45 AM)

**Regular Speed Limit: 35 MPH**

**School Zone Speed Limit: 25 MPH**

those associated with 0.36-mile school zone of Greenwich High School. Despite a posted speed limit of 30 mph, 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds of approximately 38 mph northbound and 40 mph southbound indicate a significant number of drivers exceed the limit (per Traffic Investigation Report #056-1509-01, updated report is 056-2409-01)


**Regular Speed Limit: 25 MPH**

**School Zone Speed Limit: 20 MPH**

Speed Limit	25 mph
Average Speed	29 mph
50 <sup>th</sup> Percentile Speed	30 mph
85 <sup>th</sup> Percentile Speed	35 mph
Max Speed	86 mph

## Site #9 – Greenwich High School (Hillside Rd)

### GREENWICH HIGH SCHOOL SCHOOL PHOTO SPEED ENFORCEMENT FOR HILLSIDE ROAD



#### Proposed School Signage



- #1 Install a new S1-1 School Sign with a School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled sign below approx 100' north of the centerline of US 1 ( E Putnam Ave.)
- #11 Install a School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled sign below the existing S1-1 School Sign located approx 500' south of the centerline of Fairfield Road.



- #2 Install a new 30 mph Speed Limit sign with an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 180' north of the centerline of US 1 ( E Putnam Ave.)



- #5 Install a new AC Power Camera approx 1075' north of the centerline of US 1 ( E Putnam Ave.) ( 250' enforcement zone.)
- #6 Install a new AC Power Camera along the east side of Hillside Road approx 1125' south of the centerline of Fairfield Road ( 250' enforcement zone.)



- #4 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 830' north of the centerline of US 1 ( E Putnam Ave.)
- #9 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 860' south of the centerline of Fairfield Road.
- #13 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 30' south of the centerline of Fairfield Road.



- #5 Install a new AC Power Camera approx 1075' north of the centerline of US 1 ( E Putnam Ave.) ( 250' enforcement zone.)
- #6 Install a new AC Power Camera along the east side of Hillside Road approx 1125' south of the centerline of Fairfield Road ( 250' enforcement zone.)



- #8 Existing S5-2 End School Zone sign is located approx 700' south of the centerline of Fairfield Road.
- #7 Install a new S5-2 End School Zone sign approx 275' north of the centerline of US 1 ( E Putnam Ave.)

*The plan for Greenwich High School stated that enforcement would only take place from 7:45am-8:45am and 2:40pm-3:40pm, yet I have received multiple citations and warnings outside of those times (i.e. at ~7:20am x2 on East Putnam and ~4:20pm on North Street) When asked, I was told the reduced speed times are "8:15am-9:15am and 3:15pm-15pm [sic]" (Note: Assumed that meant 4:15pm) Furthermore, I was told there were several programming errors with the speed limits and times of flashing beacons*

DATE	02
DRAWN	F. HARRIS
CHECKED	
DATE	
SCALE	
PROJECT	624/2025
GREENWICH HIGH SCHOOL HILLSIDE ROAD GREENWICH, CT HILLSIDE ROAD	

**Greenwich High School  
Greenwich, CT: Hillside Rd.**

**Times: (7:45 AM - 8:45 AM), (8:45 AM - 2:40 PM), (2:40 PM - 3:40 PM)**

Blue Line Solutions, LLC (BLS) conducted speed studies at Greenwich High School on Hillside Rd. during the periods and times listed below.

*Question remains: Has the time of enforcement changed from the original proposal/plan? I asked for clarification in November...*

This report was completed given the speed and time limit parameters of:

**Regular Speed Limit: 25 MPH**

**School Zone Speed Limit: 20 MPH**

*(These speeds and times don't match actual signs of 30mph and 25mph. Identical issues exist at North Street (inconsistent signs vs. plans))*

**Dates of Study:**

Monday	9/23/2024 :	(7:45 AM - 8:45 AM), (8:45 AM - 2:40 PM), (2:40 PM - 3:40 PM)
Tuesday	9/24/2024 :	(7:45 AM - 8:45 AM), (8:45 AM - 2:40 PM), (2:40 PM - 3:40 PM)
Wednesday	9/25/2024 :	(7:45 AM - 8:45 AM), (8:45 AM - 2:40 PM), (2:40 PM - 3:40 PM)
Thursday	9/26/2024 :	(7:45 AM - 8:45 AM), (8:45 AM - 2:40 PM), (2:40 PM - 3:40 PM)
Friday	9/27/2024 :	(7:45 AM - 8:45 AM), (8:45 AM - 2:40 PM), (2:40 PM - 3:40 PM)



*NOTE: These stats are WRONG because they used the WRONG speed limits - These are OVERSTATED*

**The following report only reflects dates and times listed in the dates above. During the specified dates and time periods, the traffic counts were as follows:**

*(There is no traffic report as required for any times before 7:45am or after 3:40pm)  
An extension of operating times on both sides without traffic surveys or notice is not an "incidental" change to a plan*

Date	(7:45 AM - 8:45 AM)			(8:45 AM - 2:40 PM)			(2:40 PM - 3:40 PM)		
	Vehicle Count	Speeders	% Speeding	Vehicle Count	Speeders	% Speeding	Vehicle Count	Speeders	% Speeding
9/23/2024	571	139	24.3%	1,295	181	14.0%	402	71	17.7%
9/24/2024	743	197	26.5%	1,369	180	13.1%	465	116	24.9%
9/25/2024	677	138	20.4%	1,543	171	11.1%	419	99	23.6%
9/26/2024	644	121	18.8%	1,411	154	10.9%	489	119	24.3%
9/27/2024	584	102	17.5%	1,621	205	12.6%	467	108	23.1%
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>3,219</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>21.7%</b>	<b>7,239</b>	<b>891</b>	<b>12.3%</b>	<b>2,242</b>	<b>513</b>	<b>22.9%</b>

*Furthermore, because school zone signs and speed limit signs were missing and not visible, that easily explains the higher rate of speeding - The stats cannot be relied on*

*Q: Why are towns required to notify drivers of the location and times of enforcement?*

*A: So that operators/drivers are reasonably informed and can comply*

*It's a pretty easy argument that the locations and times of enforcement are unclear based on inconsistent information provided to the public, inadequate and missing signage, media reports and public comments/feedback*

Guidance for Municipalities Developing an Automated Traffic Enforcement Safety Device (ATESD) Plan – CT DOT

***Such notification shall include appropriate detail as to the nature and hours of operation of the enforcement device, and how the municipality will support such location-based applications through baseline mapping platforms***

*Changing the time of enforcement and location of enforcement without notice violates the requirements of Public Act 23-116*

Publicize changes, including new camera locations. Reinstate the probationary period before ticketing begins at new locations.

**Site #10- Traffic/ADT Data: E. Putnam Ave**

*Extending the times to earlier in the morning and later in the afternoon AND extending the school zone hours (i.e. 2pm-4pm rather than 2:40pm-3:40pm) is not consistent with the plan and not supported by the traffic studies, nor was it publicized – I asked for clarification ahead of time and was told a different time of enforcement – It's blatantly unjust to change enforcement times without public notice – Is it now 7am-4pm? No reasonable person can follow a rule that constantly changes*

(d) In no event shall a municipality use, install or operate an automated traffic enforcement safety device unless such use, installation or operation complies with the provisions of a plan approved by the Department of Transportation and the approval of such plan is effective.



**Blue Line Solutions, LLC**  
 4409 Oakwood Dr., Chattanooga, TN 37416  
 Tel: (855) 252-0086 Fax: (423) 803-1500  
[www.bluelinesolutions.com](http://www.bluelinesolutions.com)

**Greenwich High School**  
 Greenwich, CT: E. Putnam Ave.

**Times: (7:45 AM - 8:45 AM), (8:45 AM - 2:40 PM), (2:40 PM - 3:40 PM)**

**in-ci-den-tal** [in(t)sə'den(t)]

1. accompanying but not a major part of something:

*It can't be an "incidental" change if the public needs to know the change by law in order to comply with the change or if that particular change is going to be enforced. Removing a requirement would be incidental, but Adding / Increasing / Extending a requirement cannot be incidental. The same logic applies to locations of school zones as it does to times of enforcement.*

*Justifying a school zone change without traffic studies / TIR's to reflect a dramatically different and expanded time frame are not merely time-of-day or incidental changes, despite the request to LTA. The ATESD plan was only authorized to operate during the school times proposed and analyzed. At the very least, public notice was required for changes to the times per CGS. The record of times of enforcement must be released publicly in addition to being maintained by the LTA.*

**"Speed limits will only be in effect... for the hours listed"**

Blue Line Solutions, LLC (BLS) conducted speed studies at Greenwich High School on E. Putnam Ave. during the periods and times listed below.

This report was completed given the speed and time limit parameters of:

**Regular Speed Limit: 35 MPH**      **School Zone Speed Limit: 25 MPH**

**Dates of Study:**

Wednesday	10/9/2024	(7:45 AM - 8:45 AM), (8:45 AM - 2:40 PM), (2:40 PM - 3:40 PM)
Thursday	10/10/2024	(7:45 AM - 8:45 AM), (8:45 AM - 2:40 PM), (2:40 PM - 3:40 PM)
Friday	10/11/2024	(7:45 AM - 8:45 AM), (8:45 AM - 2:40 PM), (2:40 PM - 3:40 PM)
Tuesday	10/15/2024	(7:45 AM - 8:45 AM), (8:45 AM - 2:40 PM), (2:40 PM - 3:40 PM)
Wednesday	10/16/2024	(7:45 AM - 8:45 AM), (8:45 AM - 2:40 PM), (2:40 PM - 3:40 PM)

The following report only reflects dates and times listed in the dates above. During the specified dates and time periods, the traffic counts were as follows:

Date	(7:45 AM - 8:45 AM)			(8:45 AM - 2:40 PM)			(2:40 PM - 3:40 PM)		
	Vehicle Count	Speeders	% Speeding	Vehicle Count	Speeders	% Speeding	Vehicle Count	Speeders	% Speeding
10/9/2024	1,322	305	23.1%	7,471	326	4.4%	1,120	235	21.0%
10/10/2024	1,246	241	19.3%	7,736	283	3.7%	1,163	268	23.0%
10/11/2024	1,187	268	22.6%	8,293	308	3.7%	1,097	201	18.3%
10/15/2024	1,236	300	24.3%	7,902	406	5.1%	1,164	252	21.6%
10/16/2024	1,289	342	26.5%	7,537	288	3.8%	999	218	21.8%
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>6,280</b>	<b>1,456</b>	<b>23.2%</b>	<b>38,939</b>	<b>1,611</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	<b>5,543</b>	<b>1,174</b>	<b>21.2%</b>

*Was there really justification for a speed zone with a < 4% speeding problem most days?*

*And remember, this is BEFORE the required posting of speed limit and school zone signs*

**5 Day Total Vehicle Count:**

**50,762**

**5 Day Total Speeding Violations Recorded:**

**4,241**

4. Approve a “School Speed Limit 25 MPH When Flashing” for the northbound direction on U.S. Route 1 (East Putnam Avenue) in the Town of Greenwich from Old Church Road (mile point 2.66) to Woodside Drive (mile point 3.14), a distance of 0.48 miles.

The “School Speed Limit 25 MPH When Flashing” speed limit will only be in effect when the flashing warning lights are in operation. This will be on Monday through Friday when school is in session for the hours listed below and during activities outside of these hours with approval of the Local Traffic Authority:

7:45 a.m. - 8:45 a.m.  
2:40 p.m. - 3:40 p.m.

**From:** Kiselak, Michael <Michael.Kiselak@greenwichct.gov>  
**Sent:** Friday, August 30, 2024 3:03 PM  
**To:** DOT OSTA <DOT.OSTA@ct.gov>  
**Cc:** Michel, James <James.Michel@greenwichct.gov>; Circosta Cohee, Gabriella <Gabriella.Cohee@greenwichct.gov>  
**Subject:** Greenwich School Zone Speed Limit Time Modifications - Greenwich High School

You don't often get email from michael.kiselak@greenwichct.gov. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL EMAIL: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Good afternoon,

We at Greenwich DPW have been evaluating and preparing our school zone beacons for the upcoming 24/25 school year. Some changes to local school bell times have come to our attention so we would like to have the official approved time periods updated to reflect the current bell times.

The only public school with any changes this year is Greenwich High School; the start time remains the same (8:30am) but the dismissal time has moved up from 3:15pm to 2:55pm Monday-Friday. The current associated reduced speed limit timeframes for East Putnam Avenue and Hillside Road are 7:45am-8:45am and 3:00pm-4:00pm per TIR 056-2311-01. We are hereby requesting changing the afternoon period to 2:40pm-3:40pm for East

1

Putnam and Hillside. The Greenwich High periods were modified last year by administrative approval so we would appreciate if the same process can be used again. We do not propose any changes to the physical extents of the Greenwich High school zones.

CT.GOV | State of Connecticut

Department of Transportation

Home Travel Business Publications Bureaus News Programs & Projects About

## Red-light and Speed Safety Camera Guidelines for Connecticut Municipalities: Submitted Plans

**Municipal plans approved**

- Beacon Falls, CT - Approved November 24, 2025
- Fairfield, CT - Approved December 11, 2025
- Greenwich, CT - Approved July 7, 2025**

Popular Links

- A-Z Index
- Media Contact
- Report an Issue on a State Road

*This is the plan that was approved... At least it's the only plan that drivers have access to from CT DOT under "approved plans" – It must be followed. ATESD's cannot be operated unless it complies with the plan*

(d) In no event shall a municipality use, install or operate an automated traffic enforcement safety device unless such use, installation or operation complies with the provisions of a plan approved by the Department of Transportation and the approval of such plan is effective.

Public Act No. 23-116

<b>Street Name/ *Parking Lot</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Compass Direction</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Distance</b>	<b>Requested Speed Limit</b>
Lower Cross Road (Rescind previous approval)	150' east of Lake Avenue	both directions	1215' east of Lake Avenue	.20 of a mile	20 MPH 8:15 – 9:15 a.m. 2:45 – 3:45 p.m. School Days When Flashing
North Street (Rescind previous approval)	250' south of Doubling Road	both directions	630' south of Roberta Lane	.41 of a mile	25 MPH 8:15 – 9:15 a.m. 2:45 – 3:45 p.m. School Days When Flashing

**Recommendation:** *I would make the argument that rescinding a lower speed limit (back to a higher speed limit) or narrowing enforcement times MAY qualify as incidental – However, lowering speed limits or broadening enforcement times is NOT incidental*

1. Rescind existing Parkway Elementary School “School Speed Limit 20 MPH When Flashing” for the westbound direction of travel on Lower Cross Road from CP Pole #74096 westerly to Lake Avenue.
2. Rescind existing “School Speed Limit 25 MPH When Flashing” for both directions of travel on North Street #1 from Doubling Road northerly to a point 0.13 miles south of Roberta Lane, a distance of 0.33 miles.
3. Grant permission to the Town of Greenwich to establish “School Speed Limit 20 MPH When Flashing” for both directions of travel on Lower Cross Road from 150’ east of Lake Avenue easterly to 1215’ east of Lake Avenue, a distance of 0.20 miles.
4. Grant permission to the Town of Greenwich to establish “School Speed Limit 25 MPH When Flashing” for both directions of travel on North Street #1 from 250’ south of Doubling Road northerly to 630’ south of Roberta Lane, a distance of 0.41 miles.

The “School Speed Limit When Flashing” zones will only be in effect when the flashing warning lights are in operation, which will be during the hours noted below on Monday through Friday when school is in session, and during activities outside these hours with approval of the Local Traffic Authority:

8:15 a.m. – 9:15 a.m.  
2:45 p.m. – 3:45 p.m.

*Or is it 3:15pm-4:15pm as instructed? Why am I getting violations at ~4:20pm?*

**Direction from law enforcement officer as to time in effect of school zone periods was misleading**

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 16, 2025 8:56 AM  
**To:** Smith, James D. <James.Smith@greenwichct.gov>  
**Subject:** Speed Limit Question / North Street School

[EXTERNAL]  
Sgt. Smith,

I have four young children that are students and their safety (and all student safety) is paramount. I would like to understand what the speed limit is on North Street at Doubling Road (near North Street School). Safety is a great goal but safety and enforcement without clarity for drivers is challenging.

The posted signs appear to indicate a 35mph speed limit at the school and 40mph speed limits further down North Street, except when a school zone sign is flashing (without any times listed) when it appears to indicate a 25mph speed limit. A little online research seems to indicate the likely hours/times that 25mph speed limits are in effect are 8:15am-9:15am, 9:15am-2:00pm, and 2:00pm-4:00pm (but that's not clear from the sign itself).

State and town websites also indicate 25mph when flashing and 35mph otherwise.

I just received a warning letter that said the posted speed limit was 30mph, while another section of the same letter said the posted speed limit was 25mph (even though it was well outside of the school zone hours posted online and the signs were not flashing). Neither of the speed limits in the letter (25mph and 30mph) match the 35mph speed limit sign on the street itself.

Blue Line traffic surveys show that ~during 25mph school zone hours~ approximately half of all drivers (45%) were speeding 11mph+ over the designated speed limit. The average speed of traffic was 36mph, the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile was 37mph, and the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile was 42mph. The study doesn't show speeds after 4:00pm, but it strongly implies that average speeds are likely significantly faster after those school zone periods, given the 10mph higher speed limit.

This is all a long-handed way of asking for clarification on what the speed limits are at the North School speed camera (both within and outside of school zone periods). I would also love to have clarification for all drivers as to when the school zone periods are in effect (since it's unclear from the sign itself).

Since the speed zones shift often (i.e. 25mph, 30mph, 35mph, 40mph, etc.) along North Street, the signs and notifications (and lack thereof) at North School in particular are unclear and confusing for drivers.

Thank you,  
[REDACTED]

Re: Speed Limit Question / North Street School

Smith, James D. <James.Smith@greenwichct.gov>  
To: [REDACTED]

Hi Mr. [REDACTED]

Sorry for the delayed response. The speed camera program has created an immense amount of inquiries for us to sort through on top of our other day to day tasks.

There was a programming error on North St with a speed of 30 mph, that has since been corrected and amended to 35 mph. My apologies for that. No actual citations have been sent out with the incorrect speed limit.



During the school day the regular speed limit of 35 mph is enforced, during drop off and dismissal the reduced speed of 25 mph is enforced. The reduced speed times are as follows: 0815-0915AM hrs and 315 hrs-15PM hrs.

The flashing beacons indicate that the reduced speed is in effect. The State does not require that school hours be posted signage.

Additionally there was an issue with a flashing beacon while traveling north approaching St. Michaels, that has since been rectified.

I hope that you find this helpful. Have a great Thanksgiving.

Respectfully,  
Sgt. JD Smith  
Greenwich Police Department  
Traffic Section  
DRE #22859  
Work Cell: 203-517-6875  
Desk: 203-622-8015



*Direction from law enforcement officer as to time in effect of school zone periods was misleading*

(j) The following defenses shall be available to the owner of a motor vehicle who is alleged to have committed a violation of such ordinance adopted under this section: (1) The operator was driving an emergency vehicle in accordance with the provisions of subdivision (1) of subsection (b) of section 14-283; (2) the traffic control signal was inoperative, which is observable on the recorded images; (3) the violation was necessary in order for the operator to comply with an order or direction from a law enforcement officer, which is observable on the recorded images; (4) the violation was necessary to allow the passage of an authorized emergency vehicle, which is observable on the recorded images; (5) the violation took place during a period of time in which the motor vehicle had been reported as being stolen to a law enforcement unit, as defined in section 7-294a, and had not been recovered prior to the time of the violation; or (6) the automated traffic enforcement safety device was not in compliance with the calibration check required pursuant to subsection (h) of this section.

# Compliance Issues

- Sign Types
- Locations
- Visibility Issues
- Placement Issues

Yes — the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) *does* include a provision about how signs should be oriented relative to the view of approaching traffic.

✦ **MUTCD Orientation Requirement**

In the MUTCD (both the older 2009 edition and the newer 11th Edition), Section 2A.20 (or 2A.17 in the 11th Edition) under *Orientation* states:

**"Unless otherwise provided in this Manual, signs should be vertically mounted at right angles to the direction of, and facing, the traffic that they are intended to serve."** MUTCD +1

In plain language, this means:

► **Traffic signs must be mounted at a 90° angle to the direction of approaching traffic**

So the sign face should be perpendicular to the travel direction of motorists who are intended to read it. This ensures the sign is most visible and legible to the approaching road user. MUTCD

FAIL...



FAIL...



*This key/only sign (at the intersection of East Putnam and Old Church Road) is obstructed and impossible to see from Old Church Road approach*

MUTCD 11th Edition

**GENERAL**

**Section 2B.01 Application of Regulatory Signs**

**Standard:**


- 01 **Regulatory signs shall be used to inform road users of selected traffic laws or regulations and to indicate the applicability of the legal requirements.**
- 02 **Regulatory signs shall be installed at or near where the regulations apply. The signs shall clearly indicate the requirements imposed by the regulations and shall be designed and installed to provide adequate visibility and legibility in order to obtain compliance.**
- 03 **Regulatory signs shall be retroreflective or illuminated (see Section 2A.21).**

*Signs are supposed to be visible from 100ft away – Many school zone signs aren't visible even from much shorter distances*



*Another corollary - because the school zone speed limit sign is not at a right angle to Old Church Road, it is not intended to serve notice to those drivers*

*Obstructed Regulatory / Warning Signs At Greenwich High School*



*School Zone Signs Are Obstructed Because they were placed immediately behind trees in violation of MUTCD regulations and OSTA guidance and even explicit directions in the Greenwich proposal*

**Section 2B.01 Application of Regulatory Signs**

**Standard:**


- 01 Regulatory signs shall be used to inform road users of selected traffic laws or regulations and to indicate the applicability of the legal requirements.
- 02 Regulatory signs shall be installed at or near where the regulations apply. The signs shall clearly indicate the requirements imposed by the regulations and shall be designed and installed to provide adequate visibility and legibility in order to obtain compliance.

Three contradictory “end school zone” signs still exist on the same block of East Putnam Ave



Why are there three “end school zone” locations at different points between Old Church Road and Hillside along East Putnam (presumably all in the same school zone) -- Did one get added to what is now outside of the recognized school zone? (#9) and it isn't located next to the speed zone start sign as required. Regardless, the “End School Zone” is in three different areas (perhaps four) on East Putnam

Where the school zone begins and ends is NOT consistent – It is NOT clear – There are signs in vastly different areas (at least 3 different inconsistencies, 4 in total)



Despite three or four “End School Zone” signs within two blocks, there are none of the required “Begin School Zone” or speed limit signs across the street at the same point...

There are no other school signs from the opposite direction / flow of traffic at these same points



- #8 Existing 55-2 End School Zone sign is located approx 55' east of the centerline of Woodside Drive.
- #9 Install a new 55-2 End School Zone sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.



*Signs are not posted according to MUTCD standards throughout Greenwich – Compliance problems are not just limited to East Putnam – The town should undergo a comprehensive review and audit of all school zone speed limit signs in Greenwich*

The installation of all signage is the responsibility of the Town and must conform with and be installed per the latest edition of the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices*. In particular, speed limit signs shall be located as near as practicable to where the school speed zone begins in each direction and all speed limit signs should be erected on a separate post and should not be mounted on utility poles. Care should be taken to locate signs behind guide rails, on property lines, five (5) feet +/- in front of utility poles, behind end walls, and, in general, where the sign will command attention and be of least irritation to the abutting property owners. The Town of Greenwich is responsible for installing and maintaining the flashing lights as well as providing power and paying for the electricity needed to operate the flashing lights.



*Older version*

← *Obstructed “End School Zone” signs at GCDS One on Fairfield Rd & One on Old Church Rd)*

In accordance with Section 14-298 of the Connecticut General Statutes, the OSTA has adopted the relevant portions of the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD) as its regulations for the purpose of standardization and uniformity of traffic control signals, devices, signs, and markings on public roadways within the State.

The installation of all signage is the responsibility of the Town of Greenwich and must conform with and be installed per the latest edition of the MUTCD. In particular, speed limit signs shall be located as near as practical to where the school speed zone begins in each direction and all speed limit signs should be erected on a separate post and should not be mounted on utility poles. Care should be taken to locate signs behind guide rails, on property lines, ten (10) feet +/- in front of utility poles, behind end walls, and, in general, where the sign will command attention and be of least irritation to the abutting property owners.

*Newest version*



*Signs not located at beginning/end of school zone on East Putnam and neither the sign nor the flashing lights can be read from Old Church Road approach*



*Speed Limit Signs improperly located adjacent to or within 5 feet of utility poles*

*Note: Sign also broken, which is common*



**Flashing beacons are routinely broken – wrong times / always flashing / never flashing  
Unreliable for drivers and are ignored as a direct result of regular problems**

*Multiple issues with flashing lights outside of their operating times (24 hours a day) and beacons that don't flash at all during the enforcement period (North Street, Fairfield Rd.). Issues with flashing beacons (non-stop / not-working) have been acknowledged by Sgt. Smith. Issues with incorrect programming of speed limits have also been acknowledged. Even the OSTA submission is plagued with contradictory speed limits.*

*The flashing beacons are not reliable, which is why we specifically asked for a list of times the speed cameras were operational.*


*We were told in writing 8:15am-9:15am and 3:15pm-4:15pm (on November 26, 2025). The OSTA submissions for East Putnam show vastly different / narrower enforcement times than the flashing beacons.*



Additionally there was an issue with a flashing beacon

Figure 2B-32. Photo Enforcement Signs and Plaques

This was the warning sign chosen by Greenwich – It is NOT the required sign



These Are The REQUIRED ATESD Warning Signs Consistent With Other CT Towns →



- Standard:
- 04 The Traffic Signal Photo Enforced (R10-18a) sign shall not be installed on approaches to signalized locations where red-light cameras are not present on any of the approaches to the signalized location.

R10-18 is to be used at jurisdictional boundaries

R10-18a is to be used at red-light cameras

R10-19P/aP is to be used at speed cameras / may be mounted below a regulatory sign

Why was the least relevant sign chosen instead of following Attachment A?

Why is it not installed with a regulatory / warning (speed) sign on East Putnam?

Why is it not mounted below a warning sign for a school zone in **FGY** color?

Section 2C.69 Photo Enforced Plaques (W16-10P and W16-10aP)

- Option:
- 01 A Photo Enforced (W16-10P) plaque or a PHOTO ENFORCED (W16-10aP) word message plaque (see Figure 2C-16) may be mounted below a warning sign to advise road users that the regulations associated with the condition being warned about (such as a traffic control signal or a toll plaza) are being enforced by photographic equipment.



Site #10- Roadway Images: Greenwich High School (E. Putnam Ave)

GREENWICH HIGH SCHOOL  
SCHOOL PHOTO SPEED ENFORCEMENT FOR E PUTNAM AVENUE

**Proposed School Signage**

- 001 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 500' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 002 Install an R10-18a Photo Enforced sign approx 500' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 003 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 200' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 004 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 10' west of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 005 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 006 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 007 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 008 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 009 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 010 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 011 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 012 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 013 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 014 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 015 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 016 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 017 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 018 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 019 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 020 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 021 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 022 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 023 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 024 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 025 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 026 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 027 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 028 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 029 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 030 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 031 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 032 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 033 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 034 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 035 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 036 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 037 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 038 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 039 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 040 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 041 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 042 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 043 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 044 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 045 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 046 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 047 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 048 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 049 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 050 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 051 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 052 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 053 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 054 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 055 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 056 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 057 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 058 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 059 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 060 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 061 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 062 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 063 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 064 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 065 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 066 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 067 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 068 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 069 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 070 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 071 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 072 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 073 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 074 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 075 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 076 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 077 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 078 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 079 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 080 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 081 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 082 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 083 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 084 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 085 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 086 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 087 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 088 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 089 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 090 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 091 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 092 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 093 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 094 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 095 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 096 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 097 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 098 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 099 Install an R10-19P Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.
- 100 Install an R10-19aP Photo Enforced sign approx 100' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.

**These are both the wrong signs**

OTHER REGULATORY SIGNS AND PLAQUES

Section 2B.69 Photo Enforced Signs and Plaques (R10-18, R10-18a, R10-19P, R10-19aP)

- Option:
- 01 A Traffic Laws Photo Enforced (R10-18) sign (see Figure 2B-32) may be installed at a jurisdictional boundary to advise road users that some of the traffic regulations within that jurisdiction are being enforced by photographic equipment.
  - 02 A Traffic Signal Photo Enforced (R10-18a) sign (see Figure 2B-32) may be installed in advance of or at a traffic signal to advise road users that compliance with the signal is enforced by photographic equipment. A Signal Ahead (W3-3) sign and a Traffic Signal Photo Enforced (R10-18a) sign may be used on the same approach provided that they are on separate supports.
  - 03 A Photo Enforced (R10-19P) plaque or a PHOTO ENFORCED (R10-19aP) word message plaque (see Figure 2B-32) may be mounted below a regulatory sign to advise road users that the regulation is being enforced by photographic equipment.



## Automated Traffic Enforcement Safety Device (ATESD) Guidance for Municipalities

Office of the State Traffic Administration



ATESD Guidance for Municipalities  
January 2025

### *ATESD Guidance For Municipalities – January 2025*

*A scaled roadway plan or an aerial image showing the location for the ATESD at a traffic control signal, School Zone, Pedestrian Safety Zone, or other location(s). The plan or aerial image must also show the proposed location and sign description of the **required two conspicuous signs to be installed on every approach at a reasonable distance in advance of the ATESD**. See **Attachment A** for the details regarding **the required signs**. Such required conspicuous signs are only permitted to be installed at locations where the ATESD is currently operational.*

**These Are The REQUIRED ATESD Warning Signs For Consistency & Uniformity**

<https://crocgt.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/4a.-60-Seconds-for-Safety-CTDOT-Automated-Traffic-Enforcement-Safety-Guide.pdf>

**Attachment A  
(Required Signage)**

Sign detail options for "Photo Enforced" to be installed *below a speed limit sign*

Sign detail options for "Speed Limit –Photo Enforced" *stand alone sign*

**SIGN DETAIL**  
1:15

NOTES:  
 \* OSTA APPROVAL REQUIRED  
 \* MOUNT BELOW "REGULATORY SPEED LIMIT SIGN 31-5505 (24"x30") FOR SINGLE LANE OR 31-5504 (30"x36") FOR MULTI-LANE ROADS

SIGN NUMBER	31-0808				
PANEL SIZE	2'-0" x 2'-0"				
TOTAL AREA	4.0 Sq.Ft.				
MUTCD	R10-19P (CT)				
BDR INSET/WIDTH	0.38"/0.63"				
CORNER RADIUS	1.5"				
BACKGROUND	TYPE: XI COLOR: White				
LEGEND/BORDER	TYPE: XI COLOR: Black/Black				
* REFER TO CATALOG OF SIGNS FOR SHEETING TYPE WHEN COLOR IS BLACK TYPE IS "PLAIN".					
SYMBOL	ROTATION	X	Y	WID	HT
Camera	0	7.9	12.5	8.3	9

REV'D /

File name: 31-0808 Printed: 10/3/2023

LETTER POSITIONS (X)										LENGTH	SERIES/SIZE	
P	H	O	T	O							D	2000
6	6.5	11.1	13.7	15.9							12	3
E	N	F	O	R	C	E	D				D	2000
2.2	4.5	7.3	9.5	12.3	14.8	17.4	19.8				19.7	3

Dimensions are in Inches  
Material : 0.080" Thick Sheet Aluminum  
Ground Mounted

**SIGN DETAIL**  
1:15

NOTES:  
 \* OSTA APPROVAL REQUIRED  
 \* FOR USE ON SINGLE LANE AND MULTI-LANE ROADS

SIGN NUMBER	31-0813				
PANEL SIZE	3'-0" x 2'-0"				
TOTAL AREA	6.0 Sq.Ft.				
MUTCD	R10-18				
BDR INSET/WIDTH	0.38"/0.63"				
CORNER RADIUS	1.5"				
BACKGROUND	TYPE: XI COLOR: White				
LEGEND/BORDER	TYPE: XI COLOR: Black/Black				
* REFER TO CATALOG OF SIGNS FOR SHEETING TYPE WHEN COLOR IS BLACK TYPE IS "PLAIN".					
SYMBOL	ROTATION	X	Y	WID	HT
Camera	0	13.9	12.5	8.3	9

REV'D /

File name: 31-0813 Printed: 10/3/2023

LETTER POSITIONS (X)										LENGTH	SERIES/SIZE				
S	P	E	E	D		L	I	M	I	T		C	2000		
7.4	9.5	11.8	13.9	15.9	17.6	20.6	22.5	23.4	26.3	27.1		21.3	3		
P	H	O	T	O		E	N	F	O	R	C	E	D	C	2000
3	5.3	7.5	9.7	11.6	13.3	16.3	18.3	20.6	22.5	24.9	27	29.3	31.3	30	3

Dimensions are in Inches  
Material : 0.080" Thick Sheet Aluminum  
Ground Mounted

**"Traffic Laws Photo Enforced" Is NOT One Of The Options Allowed AT The ATESD Locations**

*Warning Signs Are Incorrect*

**6. New Business**

- a. Request for approval of ordinance on Use of Automated Traffic Enforcement Safety Devices (*First Read*) – Chief of Police James Heavey.

Town Administrator and Chief Operating Officer Ben Branyan explained that per the Town Charter, the Board is the Town's traffic authority and approval of camera use would not require approval by the Representative Town Meeting. He explained that the request for proposals has gone out to bid with a May 9 deadline for bid submissions and that it is hoped that a second read of the proposal would be scheduled for the May 9 Board meeting. He also said it is anticipated the cameras would be installed in private and public school zones where there are traffic issues.


Chief Heavey explained that the department already uses various technologies for traffic safety including license plate readers. He explained there would be traffic studies conducted at all school locations prior to installation of the cameras and warning signs at 15 public school and 6 private school locations. A hearing process to appeal tickets issued to drivers will need to be established. Revenue from fines would be paid to the camera vendor to cover installation expenses with the remainder of the fines going into a fund that would be earmarked for traffic safety initiatives, Chief Heavey explained.

Ms. Stone McGuigan suggested a public information session to explain to the public how the program will work. Ms. Rabin suggested the Town use video and digital media to inform the public.

*From April 2024 Selectmen Meeting – Where are the correct warnings signs?*

*R10-18 is a poor choice to serve as warning signs - they don't match other municipalities (not standard or uniform) and don't meet the Attachment A guidance. If school zone speeding is what is being enforced, then put "speed limit" signs up – put "speed limit photo enforced" signs up as the best option – put "school zone ahead" signs on all approaches instead of just two approaches. Put "school zone" signs within the school zone and near the beginning of the school zones. Furthermore, **they're required and specifically identified in Attachment A:***

*Two Conspicuous Required Warning Signs Of This Type:*



*This Sign Is Not Correct According To Attachment A:*



**NCUTCD PROPOSAL FOR CHANGES TO THE MANUAL ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES**

COMMITTEE / TASK FORCE: Regulatory and Warning Signs Technical Committee  
 ITEM NUMBER: 25A-RW-03  
 TOPIC: Photo Enforcement/Automated Enforcement Signs  
 ORIGIN OF REQUEST: Automated Enforcement MCTF  
 AFFECTED SECTIONS: 2B.03, 2B.69, 2C.03, 2C.69  
 OF MUTCD: 6H.01  
 7B.01, 7B.02, 8B.02, 8B.10a

*There is an excellent and comprehensive explanation of why "Traffic Laws Photo Enforced" is a poor choice and does not meet several requirements in the case of speed cameras in Connecticut*

**DEVELOPMENT HISTORY:**  
 Approved by RWSTC: 01/09/2025  
 Approved by TTC: 01/09/2025  
 Approved by RRLRT TC: 01/09/2025  
 Approved by NCUTCD Council:

# National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices



13236 North 7th Street, Suite 4-259, Phoenix, Arizona 85022  
 Phone/Text: 231-4-NCUTCD (231-462-8823)  
 E-mail: secretary@ncutcd.org Website: https://ncutcd.org

*These are the new standards per ATESD instructions & MUTCD*




Figure 2 Example Applications

**SUMMARY:**

Automated and photo enforcement have been expanding in the US. The 2017 NTSB Report on crashes involving passenger vehicles ~~calls for greater use of this technique~~. In a 2010 congressional hearing on the topic, they noted the need for prominent posting. Communities have utilized photo or automated enforcement in various ways and signing ranges from inconsistent to non-existent, resulting in states enacting laws in the void. Advances in technology have led to a range of applications beyond single fixed sites (mobile and combination applications). The purpose of this proposal is to improve traffic control device uniformity given the emerging applications.

**DISCUSSION:**

Photo and automated enforcement use has been growing with attention on safety. States and local jurisdictions have used advancing technology to expand applications. In 2010 Congress held a subcommittee hearing on automated traffic enforcement<sup>1</sup>. A significant point was raised by then Rep. DeFazio about prominent posting. In 2017 the NTSB identified 15 states that allowed automated speed enforcement (ASE) and made recommendations to expand the use of ASE nationally<sup>2</sup>. The GHSAs urges states to utilize automated enforcement to address problems of red light running, speeding, school bus and school zone violations, work zone violations, and distracted driving<sup>3</sup>. Forward to today and the text of the 11th Edition of the MUTCD and the text from the 2000 MUTCD are basically the same. While the MUTCD was static, many states and cities have advanced legislation that has gotten very specific about sign wording and placement.

**RECOMMENDED MUTCD CHANGES:**

The following present the proposed changes to the current MUTCD within the context of the current MUTCD language. Proposed additions to the MUTCD are shown in blue underline and proposed deletions from the MUTCD are shown in ~~red strikethrough~~. Changes previously approved by NCUTCD Council (but not yet adopted by FHWA) are shown in green double underline for additions and ~~green double strikethrough~~ for deletions. In some cases, background comments may be provided with the MUTCD text. These comments are indicated by bracketed white text in shaded green. Deletions made by a technical committee or task force after initial distribution to sponsoring organizations are shown in highlighted red strikethrough and Helvetica text. Additions made by a technical committee or task force after initial distribution to sponsoring organizations are shown in underline blue and Helvetica text.

**PART 2. SIGNS**

**CHAPTER 2B. REGULATORY SIGNS, BARRICADES, AND GATES GENERAL**

**Section 2B.03 Size of Regulatory Signs**

**Table 2B-1. Regulatory Sign and Plaque Sizes**

Sign or Plaque	Sign Designation	Section	Single Lane	Multi-Lane	Expressway	Freeway	Minimum	Overhead
<del>Traffic Laws Photo Enforced</del>	<del>R10-18</del>	<del>2B-69</del>	<del>36 x 24</del>	<del>36 x 24</del>	<del>48 x 30</del>	<del>54 x 36</del>	-	<del>54 x 36</del>
<del>Traffic Signal Photo Enforced</del>	<del>R10-18a</del>	<del>2B-69</del>	<del>30 x 42</del>	<del>30 x 42</del>	<del>30 x 42</del>	-	-	<del>36 x 54</del>

*Guidance: 01b. Where no advance warning sign with supplementary Photo Enforced warning plaque (W10-16P, W10-16aP, W10-16bP, see Section 2C.69) is appropriate for the photo enforcement application involving a regulation, Photo Enforced (R10-19P or R10-19aP) plaques should be used with the corresponding regulatory sign.*

The end result of the proposed changes would be to guide practitioners to more uniform applications. Below are images of example application outcomes of this proposal (Figure 2).

2C.69. It continues to state that the R10-19P and R10-19aP are plaques to supplement regulatory signs to advise road users that the regulation is being enforced by photographic equipment. However, there are no clarifications that would lead to uniform applications and no clarity as to when warning and regulatory signs are needed. This lack of clarity has historically led to a wide range of non-uniform applications (see Figure 1), as the language does not address a growing range of applications (schools and work zones) and advancing technologies (multiple enforcements from a single camera, portable sites, and wider application than simply red-light running).



Figure 1 Non-Uniform Applications

**"Traffic Laws Photo Enforced" Removed In Latest Proposal**

**PROPOSAL BASIS:**

**SUPPLEMENTAL WARNING PLAQUES**

**Section 2C.69 Photo Enforced Sign and Plaques (W3-10, W16-10P and W16-10aP)**

**Option:**

01 Photo Enforced (W16-10P) plaque or a PHOTO ENFORCED (W16-10aP) word message plaque (see Figure 2C-16) may be mounted below a warning sign to advise road users that the regulations associated with the condition being warned about (such as a traffic control signal or a toll plaza) are being enforced by photographic equipment.

**Support:**

01 Automated enforcement and photo enforcement are ways to enforce certain traffic regulations with the goal of improving safety. Neither are considered traffic control devices. Photo enforcement uses cameras to capture images of road users (including license plates) committing moving violations. Automated enforcement uses technologies, which may or may not use photos, to enforce traffic regulations. For signing purposes, these terms are used interchangeably in the Manual.

02 State and local laws can establish requirements for prominent posting of photo enforcement. To provide uniformity in traffic control device applications related to photo enforcement, the sign and plaque applications to warning road users are mostly warning signs, but some regulatory signs and plaques are better suited to certain applications as noted in Section 2B.69. *Which they have...*

**Standard:**

03 Photo Enforced (W16-10P or W16-10aP) plaques shall match the background color of the sign with which they are displayed.

04 Photo Enforced plaques shall supplement one advance warning or one regulatory sign.

05 Photo Enforced signs or plaques shall not be used on any intersection approach or roadway segment where photo enforcement equipment is not installed.

**Guidance:**

06 An advance warning sign or regulatory sign supplemented with a Photo Enforced plaque (W16-10P, W16-10aP, R10-19P, R10-19aP) should be used in advance of locations enforcing regulations using photo enforcement equipment. See Section 2B.69 for examples of point of enforcement regulatory signing. Separate advance warning or regulatory sign installations, related to each enforcement application, should be used for photo enforcement equipment which conducts multiple enforcement activities.

07 A portable mounting of the Traffic Laws Photo Enforced (W3-10) sign should be installed in advance of mobile photo enforcement installations (see Chapter 6F).

08

or

pro

en

PART 7. TRAFFIC CONTROL FOR SCHOOL AREAS

CHAPTER 7B. SIGNS

Section 7B.01 Design of School Signs

Table 7B-1. School Area Sign and Plaque Sizes

Plaque	Sign Designation	Section	Conventional Road	Minimum	Oversized
Photo Enforced (symbol)	R10-19P	7B.02	24 x 12	-	36 x 18
Photo Enforced (regard)	R10-19aP	7B.02	24 x 18	-	36 x 24
Photo Enforced (symbol)	W16-10P	7B.02	24 x 12	-	36 x 16
Photo Enforced (plaque)	W16-10aP	7B.02	24 x 18	-	36 x 24

either State or local laws for prominent posting at the point of photo enforcement, accounting for signs are enforced by a single installation of photo

**I did not place these red X marks – This is the guidance → These two were REMOVED From Table 7B-1 in the latest proposal**

**Guidance:**

01b Where no advance warning sign with supplementary Photo Enforced warning plaque (W10-16P, W10-16aP, W10-16bP, see Section 2C.69) is appropriate for the photo enforcement application involving a regulation, Photo Enforced (R10-19P or R10-19aP) plaques should be used with the corresponding regulatory sign.


**Figure 2C-16a. Traffic Laws Photo Enforced Sign**



11 A Traffic Laws Photo Enforced (W3-10) sign may be installed at a jurisdictional boundary to advise road users that some of the traffic regulations within that jurisdiction are being enforced by photographic equipment. When a Traffic Laws Photo Enforced sign is used at jurisdictional boundaries, the Photo Enforced symbol (W16-10P) plaque may be installed instead of the legend PHOTO ENFORCED (W16-10aP) plaque.


12 The word message TRAFFIC LAWS on the Traffic Laws Photo Enforced (W3-10) sign may be replaced with the word messages such as SPEED LIMIT for specific applications which only enforce that traffic law.

[The plaques W16-10P and W16-10aP from Figure 2C-16 are shown below pertaining to this section for information and reference. Similar plaques would be added to Figure 6H-1 near W3-3 and W3-5; to Figure 7B-1 near the School Speed Limit When Flashing Sign; and Figure 8B-4 at the end. See sections below for details.]



NOTE: Add background color options to pages 3-208 and 3-209 of SHS Publication - Example →

**Figure 2B-32. Photo Enforcement Signs and Plaques**




NOTE: Add background color option to pages 3-345 and 3-346 of SHS Publication - Example →

**Figure 7B-4. Example of Signing for a School Zone with a School Speed Limit and Higher Fines Only for Speeding**

S4-5 sign doesn't exist when coming from Old Church Road – Need to be placed AFTER any intersections to be visible by all approaches

S1-1 Sign Doesn't Exist Either



School Zone notice and Speed Limit Signs should be placed as near as practicable to beginning and end of school zone which was not done on East Putnam

(Note: School Speed Limit Sign Is As Close As Practicable to Begin / End School Zone)  
School Speed Limit Sign Is required AFTER the intersection

“Signing is primarily for the benefit and direction of road users who are not familiar with the route or area”

“The basic requirements for all highway signs are that they be legible to those for whom they are intended and that they be understandable in time to permit a proper response”

“The excessive signing found on many of Connecticut’s major highways has occurred over the years and has resulted in a multitude of signs that are too small, poorly designed and placed such that they do not accomplish their intended purpose”

“Uniformity of traffic control is important for drivers and enhances safety by meeting motorists’ expectations”

– CT DOT Signing Guidelines

“Any roadway project funded with federal money must comply with the MUTCD – Since a substantial portion of funding for roadway projects in Connecticut is from the FHA, it is important that signing in Connecticut is accomplished in accordance with the standards”

– CT DOT Signing Guidelines

(Note: You have a “School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled” sign but not the required supplemental sign or showing where it begins)  
 “The School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled” sign is not standardized with the S1-1 (School Zone sign) or School Speed Limit (S5-1) sign on East Putnam

**Section 7B.06 Higher Fines Zone Signs and Plaques in School Areas**

Support:

01 The signs and plaques used to inform road users of higher fines zones and their locations depend on whether the fines apply to all traffic violations or only to speeding violations. Their locations also depend on whether the higher fines zone begins and/or ends at the same point as the school zone or school speed limit zone. Figures 7B-4 and 7B-5 show examples of higher fines zones signing.

Standard:

- 02 **Where increased fines are imposed for traffic violations within a designated school zone:**
- A. **A BEGIN HIGHER FINES ZONE (R2-10) sign (see Figure 7B-1) or a FINES HIGHER (R2-6P), FINES DOUBLE (R2-6aP), or \$XX FINE (R2-6bP) plaque (see Figure 7B-1) shall be installed as a supplement to the School Zone (S1-1) sign to identify the beginning point of the higher fines zone (see Figures 7B-4 and 7B-5); and**
  - B. **An END HIGHER FINES ZONE (R2-11) sign (see Figure 7B-1) or an END SCHOOL ZONE (S5-2) sign (see Figure 7B-1) shall be installed at the downstream end of the zone to notify road users of the termination of the increased fines zone (see Figure 7B-5).**

03 **If exceeding the speed limit is the only traffic violation that is subject to higher fines, a FINES HIGHER (R2-6P), FINES DOUBLE (R2-6aP), or \$XX FINE (R2-6bP) plaque shall be posted with the School Speed Limit (S5-1) sign and shall not be posted beneath the School Zone (S1-1) sign (see Section 7B.05).**

04 **If the portion of the roadway that is subject to higher fines does not begin at the location of the School Zone (S1-1) sign, a BEGIN HIGHER FINES ZONE (R2-10) sign shall be placed at the point where the higher fines begin (see Sheet 2 of Figure 7B-5).**

Option:

05 If a BEGIN HIGHER FINES ZONE (R2-10) sign is used downstream of the School Zone (S1-1) sign, a FINES HIGHER (R2-6P), FINES DOUBLE (R2-6aP), or \$XX FINE (R2-6bP) plaque may also be placed beneath the School Zone (S1-1) sign.

06 Where appropriate, one of the following plaques may be mounted below the sign that identifies the beginning point of the higher fines zone:

- A. A S4-1P plaque (see Figure 7B-1) specifying the times that the higher fines are in effect,
- B. A WHEN CHILDREN ARE PRESENT (S4-2P) plaque (see Figure 7B-1), or
- C. A WHEN FLASHING (S4-4P) plaque (see Figure 7B-1) if used in conjunction with a yellow flashing beacon.

Refer to any of the eight (8) other municipalities regulatory signs attached on the subsequent pages for correct examples / implementation  
 Note: The signage on Hillside Road at the high school is correct and different than the signage on East Putnam at the high school

*This sign is insufficient to meet requirements*





Standard:

- 02 Regulatory, warning, and guide signs and object markers shall be retroreflective (see Section 2A.08) or illuminated to show the same shape and similar color by both day and night, unless otherwise provided in the text discussion in this Manual for a particular sign or group of signs.
- 03 The requirements for sign illumination shall not be considered to be satisfied by street or highway lighting.



*These signs are sufficient but do not exist on East Putnam*



*There are currently none of these S1-1 signs on the eastbound East Putnam approach*



S1-1

School zone ahead

*Since the speed limit signs are not posted as directed and required, then ATESD's cannot be operated, and the certificate is not valid. In addition, the municipality has not yet met all other requirements of the Act. It cannot be enforced and in the interest of justice, East Putnam tickets must be voided and refunded retroactively unless and until all requirements are met. A credible argument can be made that ALL tickets issued under the Greenwich ATESD program are invalid because the warning / regulatory signs do not meet CT DOT / ATESD requirements.*

*“In accordance with Section 14-298 of the Connecticut General Statutes, the OSTA has adopted the relevant portions of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) as its regulations for the purpose of standardization and uniformity of traffic control signals, devices, signs, and markings on public roadways within the State.”*

**Note: ATESDs cannot be installed until the municipality’s ATESD plan has been approved by CTDOT’s Office of the State Traffic Administration (OSTA) and the municipality has met all other requirements of the Act.**

*“In accordance with Section 14-298a of the Connecticut General Statutes, this report shall serve as the certificate of approval for the school zone speed limit(s) noted above and should be retained by the municipality. The Certificate shall become valid when the speed limit signs have been posted as directed herein.”*

**Standard:**

05 Each standard sign shall be displayed only for the specific purpose as prescribed in this Manual. Determination of the particular signs to be applied to a specific condition shall be made in accordance with the provisions set forth in Part 2. Before any new highway, private road open to public travel (see definition in Section 1A.13), detour, or temporary route is opened to public travel, all necessary signs shall be in place. Signs required by road conditions or restrictions shall be removed when those conditions cease to exist or the restrictions are withdrawn.

- 07 Uniformity in design shall include shape, color, dimensions, legends, borders, and illumination or retroreflectivity.
- 08 Standardization of these designs does not preclude further improvement by minor changes in the proportion or orientation of symbols, width of borders, or layout of word messages, but all shapes and colors shall be as indicated.
- 09 All symbols shall be unmistakably similar to, or mirror images of, the adopted symbol signs, all of which are shown in the "Standard Highway Signs and Markings" book (see Section 1A.11). Symbols and colors shall not be modified unless otherwise provided in this Manual. All symbols and colors for signs not shown in the "Standard Highway Signs and Markings" book shall follow the procedures for experimentation and change described in Section 1A.10.

### 1.2. REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL LOCATIONS

The municipality must include the following in the ATESD plan submitted to the OSTA for all potential ATESD locations:

- A written justification, with supporting documentation, explaining how and why an ATESD was selected for installation at each location.
- A scaled roadway plan or an aerial image showing the location for the ATESD at a traffic control signal, School Zone, Pedestrian Safety Zone, or other location(s). The plan or aerial image must also show the proposed location of the required two conspicuous signs to be installed on every approach at a reasonable distance in advance of the ATESD. See Attachment A for the details regarding the required signs. Such required conspicuous signs are only permitted to be installed at locations where the ATESD is currently operational.

**NOTE:** A single ATESD location may consist of multiple devices on multiple approaches to properly capture images of license plates at that location.

Attachment A options:

Attachment A does not show "Traffic Laws Photo Enforced" – It shows 3 other options – "Photo Enforced" which requires mounting below a speed limit sign or "Speed Limit Photo Enforced" or "Photo Enforced" with Traffic Control Signal – It does not indicate that "Traffic Laws Photo Enforced" is allowed which is intended for jurisdictional boundaries. Note: Nearly all other towns in CT comply with Attachment A. The Greenwich ordinance requires consistency and uniformity with the rest of the state.

NOTES:  
- OSTA APPROVAL REQUIRED  
- FOR USE ON SINGLE LANE AND MULTI-LANE ROADS



NOTES:  
- OSTA APPROVAL REQUIRED  
- MOUNT BELOW REGULATORY SPEED LIMIT SIGN 31-5505 (24"x30") FOR SINGLE LANE OR 31-5504 (30"x36") FOR MULTI-LANE ROADS



### OTHER REGULATORY SIGNS AND PLAQUES

#### Section 2B.69 Photo Enforced Signs and Plaques (R10-18, R10-18a, R10-19P, R10-19aP)

Option:

- 01 A Traffic Laws Photo Enforced (R10-18) sign (see Figure 2B-32) may be installed at a jurisdictional boundary to advise road users that some of the traffic regulations within that jurisdiction are being enforced by photographic equipment.
- 02 A Traffic Signal Photo Enforced (R10-18a) sign (see Figure 2B-32) may be installed in advance of a traffic signal to advise road users that compliance with the signal is enforced by photograph. A Signal Ahead (W3-3) sign and a Traffic Signal Photo Enforced (R10-18a) sign may be used on approaches provided that they are on separate supports.
- 03 A Photo Enforced (R10-19P) plaque or a PHOTO ENFORCED (R10-19aP) word message plaque (see Figure 2B-32) may be mounted below a regulatory sign to advise road users that the regulation is being enforced by photographic equipment.


Greenwich may never see red light cameras, given current state rules. Heavy said just one or two signals in town would qualify for red light cameras based on the number of accidents at intersections and that the department is not looking at using them at this time.

This is another reason the sign chosen is inappropriate

Figure 2B-32. Photo Enforcement Signs and Plaques

Greenwich uses the wrong signs / misleading and not the clear warning signs required by Attachment A of ATESD DOT Plan Guidance  
 These signs are not consistent and uniform with the rest of the state


Intended to be used at a jurisdictional boundary, not at location of speed cameras or traffic signals, further clarified with the latest proposals and given uniformity requirements



These signs are what are required in Attachment A by OSTA for ATESD's speed camera enforcement →


Guidance for Municipalities Developing an Automated Traffic Enforcement Safety Device (ATESD) Plan  
 Date issued: January 2, 2024, Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT)

Attachment A (Required Signage)



Standard:

- 04 The Traffic Signal Photo Enforced (R10-18a) sign shall not be installed on approaches to signalized locations where red-light cameras are not present on any of the approaches to the signalized location.
- 05 A Traffic Signal Photo Enforced (R10-18a) sign shall not be installed on the same support in combination with a Signal Ahead (W3-3) sign.
- 06 If used below a regulatory sign, the Photo Enforced (R10-19P or R10-19aP) plaque shall be a rectangle with a black legend and border on a white background.



Connecticut has mandated notice at **250 feet** for urban areas and slower speed areas. Refer to Office of Legislative Research (1994) for Connecticut General Assembly

Other states such as GA mandate that warning signs must be within 500 feet of the ATESD – There are not two warning signs within either 250 or 500 feet of the device – Blue Line, Greenwich PD, and the Town of Greenwich have publicly stated this plan was modeled after other similar programs nationwide.

In the context of **warning signs related to Automated Traffic Enforcement Systems (ATESD)**:

- **Placement:** Warning signs for ATESD should be placed at least **24 by 30 inches** in size and must be visible from every lane of traffic. [↻ 1](#)
- **Distance:** Signs should be placed within **500 feet** of any speed detection device to warn approaching motorists. [↻ 1](#)


*CGS 14-307c*

(f) (1) Prior to the operation of an automated traffic enforcement safety device, the municipality shall (A) install at least two conspicuous signs at a reasonable distance in advance of such location, in accordance with the Federal Highway Administration's Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways, as amended from time to time, notifying motor vehicle operators of such location, and (B) provide notification of such location to persons, firms or corporations that operate a mobile application that is used for navigation purposes or to provide real-time information on motor vehicle traffic. The Department of Transportation shall designate which such persons, firms or corporations shall be notified and provide technical guidance to such municipalities regarding how to provide such notification.

(2) At least thirty days before the date the first automated traffic enforcement safety device becomes operational in the municipality, the municipality shall develop and implement a public awareness campaign to educate the public concerning the importance of obeying speed limits and traffic control signals and the imminent use of automated traffic enforcement safety devices in the municipality at the locations identified in the plan approved by the Department of Transportation pursuant to section 14-307e.

Confusion exists because the two conspicuous signs must be installed at a location that is operational. It's unreasonable to have photo enforcement signs 1,000+ feet away **when the legal requirement in CT is 250 feet**. A reasonable person would expect #17 and #1 to imply there is a red light camera at the adjacent/nearby major intersection. However, a sign cannot be placed where a traffic light does not have a camera. Instead, that device (and others farther away) are supposed to inform drivers of a speed camera nowhere near the sign? Illogical and Unreasonable

CGS 14-307c (f)(1)(A) explicitly requires at least two conspicuous signs at reasonable distance in advance of such location, in accordance with MUTCD, "notifying motor vehicle operators of such location" – I would argue that signs #17 and #1 give a reasonable driver no indication of where the targeted location is – In fact, it does not meet MUTCD standards, nor is it close enough to be reasonable, nor does it notify operators of the location (which is 1,000 feet down the road after a traffic light and not identified by a speed limit photo enforcement sign).



Note: The Intersection of East Putnam and Overbrook also has traffic control signal/lights – So the “traffic laws enforced” sign (#6) incorrectly warns traffic about a non-existent red-light camera rather than a “speed limit photo enforced” sign which would alleviate uncertainty and fulfill the requirement of notifying drivers of the speed camera

“Such required conspicuous signs are only permitted to be installed at locations where the ATESD is currently operational” – There is no ATESD (no traffic control / red light camera) at the intersection of East Putnam & Old Church or Overbrook


## Wrong Signs & Sign Colors

### School Zone

- Location meets definition of a School Zone (see CGS 14-212b)
- School Zone has been previously approved by the OSTA or the Local Traffic Authority (LTA)
  - OSTA approves school zones on all State Roads and all municipal roads where there is a change in speed limit
  - LTA can approve school zones in municipal roads where there is **no** change in speed limit
- School Zone signing is consistent with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)

CGS Chap 248 Sec 14-212b was written and passed in 1998 before the 2009 MUTCD codes were updated to reflect FYG mandates – However, MUTCD supersedes CT statutes.

In other words, any new “school zone ahead fines doubled” signs MUST be yellow/green



Because fines are doubled in a school zone in the statute, it triggers additional requirements for which signs must be used – The signs used/chosen are wrong – They must now reflective or illuminated, be yellow/green in color and “Fines Doubled” plaques placed beneath the school sign and speed limit sign


**Sec. 14-212b. School zones. Fines doubled.** (a) As used in this section, “local highway” means a highway that is under the control of a town, city or borough; and “local traffic authority” means the traffic authority of a town, city or borough.

(b) (1) At the request of the legislative body of a town, city or borough, the Office of the State Traffic Administration may designate as a school zone any part of a state highway that is adjacent to school property or is, in the opinion of said office, sufficiently close to school property as to constitute a risk to the public safety under all the circumstances. At the request of such legislative body, the office may revoke any such designation. (2) A local traffic authority may designate as a school zone, and may revoke any such designation, any part of a local highway that is adjacent to school property or is, in the opinion of the local traffic authority, sufficiently close to school property as to constitute a risk to the public safety under all the circumstances.

(c) The Superior Court shall impose an additional fee equivalent to one hundred per cent of the fine established or imposed for the violation of the provisions of section 14-218a or 14-219, for any such violation committed in a school zone designated in a conspicuous manner by the Office of the State Traffic Administration or local traffic authority.

(d) The Office of the State Traffic Administration with regard to a state highway or the local traffic authority with regard to a local highway shall cause to be posted a sign approved by the Office of the State Traffic Administration (1) at the beginning of a school zone in each direction that traffic is permitted to flow which shall read as follows: “SCHOOL ZONE AHEAD FINES DOUBLED”, and (2) at the end of such zone in each direction that traffic is permitted to flow which shall read as follows: “END SCHOOL ZONE”.

Connecticut General Statutes (CGS) Chapter 248, § 14-212b — the statute titled “School zones. Fines doubled” — was originally enacted as part of the Public Acts of 1998. Specifically, Public Act No. 98-252, Section 64 established this section in law. Justia Law



*This Disclaimer Is Prominently Featured On the First Page Of the Connecticut DOT Sign Catalog*

**FINES DOUBLE** R2-6aP (optional)

### DISCLAIMER:


The Sign Catalog is intended for reference purposes only. The selection, design, and placement of signs must comply with the latest edition of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).

#### Additional References:

- Traffic Guide Sheets
- FHWA Standard Highway Signs

#### What does an ATESD "school zone ahead fines doubled" sign look like?

The "school zone ahead fines doubled" sign is a yellow or fluorescent yellow-green sign with black designs. It is in the shape of an irregular pentagon, which is a rectangle with longer horizontal sides, with a triangle of top. The sign is placed at the beginning and end of a school zone to alert drivers of the increased fines for speeding violations within that area. [LawServer](#)



During the reviews, it was noted that there are currently posted speed limit signs within the proposed school zone limits. The existing speed limit signs will require relocation out of the school speed limit zone. It was also observed that the existing School Warning and School Entrance Ahead signs are not in compliance with the latest color standards contained in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and should be upgraded in conjunction with the School Zone speed limit sign installations.

MUTCD No.	Catalog No.	Legend	Width	Height	No. of Posts	Road Type *	Sheeting Type	Background Color	Sign Detail
51-1	41-2112	School (Area/Zone/Crossing)	36	36	1	SL,ML	XI	Fluor Yel/Grn	
51-1	41-2113	School (Area/Zone/Crossing)	48	48	2	O	XI	Fluor Yel/Grn	
51-1 (CT)	41-5012	Retroreflective Strip	4	48	1	A	XI	Fluor Yel/Grn	
51-1 (CT)	41-5010	Retroreflective Strip	4	72	1	A	XI	Fluor Yel/Grn	
53-1	41-2166	School Bus Stop Ahead Symbol	36	36	1	SL,ML	XI	Fluor Yel/Grn	
53-1	41-2167	School Bus Stop Ahead Symbol	48	48	2	O	XI	Fluor Yel/Grn	
53-2	41-2104	School Bus Turn Ahead	36	36	1	SL,ML	XI	Fluor Yel/Grn	

A = All P = Path SL = Single Lane ML = Multi-Lane E = Expressway F = Freeway SP = Span Mounted O = Oversize  
OC = Specific Location NR = Non-Roadway TR = Transit

CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
SIGN CATALOG

MUTCD No.	Catalog No.	Legend	Width	Height	No. of Posts	Road Type *	Sheeting Type	Background Color	Sign Detail
54-3P	41-2101	School (Plaque)	24	8	1	SL,ML	XI	Fluor Yel/Grn	
54-5a	41-2105	00 MPH School Zone Ahead	36	36	1	SL,ML	XI	Fluor Yel/Grn	

<https://newcanaanite.com/town-seeks-to-designate-additional-school-zones-for-south-saxe-and-nchs-11845501>



**S5-1(CT) is a CT sign that does not comply with MUTCD – Notice that every other school sign is FYG – MUTCD Does Not Allow A “School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled” Sign In Black & White – MUTCD Mandates S1-1 with W16-9P and S4-5a**

MUTCD No.	Catalog No.	Legend	Width	Height	No. of Posts	Road Type *	Sheeting Type	Background Color	Sign Detail
S5-1 (CT)	31-2101	School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled	36	24	2	SL,ML	IX	White	
S5-2	31-2103	End School Zone	24	30	1	SL,ML	IX	White	
S5-2	31-2105	End School Zone	36	48	2	O	IX	White	

What new signs were installed? The inconsistent use of warning / regulatory signs in Greenwich at different sites is confusing and fails the standard of uniformity

<h3>Site #1</h3> <p><b>Wrong signs, wrong color</b></p> <p><b>FAIL...</b></p> <p>#2 Install a School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled sign approx 215' north of the centerline of Rye Lake Avenue.</p> <p>#14 Install a School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled sign approx 315' north of the centerline of Lincoln Avenue.</p> <p>#3 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 100' north of the centerline of Rye Lake Avenue.</p> <p>#6 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 520' south of the centerline of Rye Lake Avenue.</p> <p>#12 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 1050' south of the centerline of the school drive.</p> <p>#17 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign along Rye Lake Avenue approx 150' west of the centerline of CR 125A (King Street).</p>	<h3>Site #6</h3> <p><b>Wrong signs, wrong color</b></p> <p><b>FAIL...</b></p> <p>#3 Relocate the existing S1-1 ( sign #3 from sheet 01) and install a School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled sign below approx 20' south of the centerline of Jofran Lane.</p> <p>#15 Existing S1-1 School Sign is located approx 41' north of the centerline of North Street.</p> <p>#4 Install a School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled sign approx 85' south of the centerline of Jofran Lane.</p> <p>#14 Install a School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled sign directly across from North Street.</p> <p>#1 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 250' north of the centerline of Jofran Lane.</p> <p>#6 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 250' south of the centerline of Jofran Lane.</p> <p>#11 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 325' north of the centerline of North Street.</p> <p>#16 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign as shown along Jofran Lane.</p> <p>#17 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign as shown along Gilego Lane.</p>
<h3>Site #2</h3> <p><b>Wrong signs, wrong color</b></p> <p><b>FAIL...</b></p> <p>#2 Install a School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled Sign approx 500' north of the centerline of Calhoun Drive.</p> <p>#15 Existing S1-1 School Sign is located approx 830' east of the centerline of Calhoun Drive.</p> <p>#3 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 300' northwest of the centerline of Calhoun Drive.</p> <p>#6 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 300' east of the centerline of Valley Drive.</p> <p>#10 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 710' east of the centerline of the School Entrance.</p> <p>#14 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 80' from the stop bar along Calhoun Drive.</p> <p>#16 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 120' from the stop bar along Valley Drive.</p> <p>#20 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 100' from the stop bar along Brookside Drive.</p>	<h3>Site #7</h3> <p><b>Wrong signs, wrong color</b></p> <p><b>FAIL...</b></p> <p>#3 Existing S1-1 School Sign is located approx 95' east of the centerline of Lake Ave.</p> <p>#14 Existing S1-1 School Sign is located approx 1,165' east of the centerline of the School Entrance.</p> <p>#4 Install a School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled sign approx 125' east of the centerline of Lake Ave.</p> <p>#13 Install a School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled sign approx 1,040' east of the centerline of the School Entrance.</p> <p>#1 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign in front of utility pole along Lower Cross Road as shown.</p> <p>#6 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 210' east of the centerline of Lake Avenue.</p> <p>#11 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 675' east of the centerline of the School Entrance.</p> <p>#16 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 1425' east of the centerline of the School Entrance.</p>
<h3>Site #3</h3> <p><b>Wrong supplemental plaque</b></p> <p><b>FAIL...</b></p> <p>#1 Install a new 25 mph Speed Limit Sign with an R10-18 sign approx 25' east of the centerline of Birch Road.</p> <p>#8 Install a new 25 mph Speed Limit Sign with an R10-18 sign approx 90' southwest of the centerline of Orchard Street.</p> <p>#3 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 540' east of the centerline of Upper Rock Lane.</p> <p>#6 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 300' west of the centerline of Combden Lane.</p> <p>#14 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 100' from the stop bar along Upper Rock Lane.</p> <p>#16 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 70' from the stop bar along Brookside Drive.</p>	<h3>Site #8</h3> <p><b>Wrong signs, wrong color</b></p> <p><b>FAIL...</b></p> <p>#4 Install a School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled sign approx 190' south of centerline of Hawkwood Lane.</p> <p>#13 Install a School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled sign approx 570' north of centerline of Avon Lane.</p> <p>#1 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 60' south of the centerline of Roberta Lane.</p> <p>#6 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 540' south of the centerline of Hawkwood Lane.</p> <p>#11 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 190' south of the centerline of Doubling Lane.</p> <p>#15 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 215' north of the centerline of Avon Lane.</p> <p>#17 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign along Doubling Road approx 100' from the centerline of North Street as shown.</p> <p>#16 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign along Hawkwood Lane approx 150' from the centerline of North Street as shown.</p>
<h3>Site #4</h3> <p><b>This is Correct - Note the difference</b></p> <p><b>Pass</b></p> <p>#1 Install an R10-18 sign below the existing 25 mph Speed Limit sign located approx 240' north of the centerline of Baywood Road.</p> <p>#13 Install an R10-18 sign below the existing 25 mph Speed Limit sign located approx 240' north of the centerline of Baywood Road.</p>	<h3>Site #9</h3> <p><b>Marginal</b></p> <p>#1 Install a new S1-1 School Sign with a School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled sign below approx 100' north of the centerline of US 1 ( E Putnam Ave).</p> <p>#11 Install a School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled sign below the existing S1-1 School Sign is located approx 500' south of the centerline of Fairhill Road.</p> <p>#2 Install a new 30 mph Speed Limit sign with an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 180' north of the centerline of US 1 ( E Putnam Ave).</p>
<h3>Site #5</h3> <p><b>This is Correct - Note the difference - Still needs proper photo enforced warning signs</b></p> <p><b>Pass</b></p> <p>#1 Relocate the existing S1-1 School Sign ( sign #2 from sheet 01) to a location below the centerline of Upham Road and add a School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled below.</p> <p>#2 Install a School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled below the existing S1-1 School Sign located approx 700' north of the centerline of the School Entrance.</p> <p>#3 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 250' north of the centerline of Old Church Road.</p> <p>#6 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 600' north of the centerline of Old Church Road.</p> <p>#12 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 400' north of the centerline of the school entrance.</p> <p>#16 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 190' south of the centerline of the Pocock Road.</p>	<h3>Site #10</h3> <p><b>Wrong sign, wrong color</b></p> <p><b>FAIL...</b></p> <p>#3 Install a School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled sign approx 120' west of the centerline of Old Church Road.</p> <p>#13 Install a School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled sign approx 165' east of the centerline of Brookridge Drive.</p> <p>#1 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 325' west of the centerline of Old Church Road.</p> <p>#6 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 550' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.</p> <p>#11 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 200' east of the centerline of Old Church Road.</p> <p>#16 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 15' west of the centerline of Indian Field Road.</p> <p>#17 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 100' north of the stop bar along Old Church Road.</p> <p>#18 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 100' south of the stop bar along Woodcock Drive.</p> <p>#19 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 100' south of the stop bar along W. Brother Drive.</p> <p>#20 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 100' south of the stop bar along Woodcock Drive.</p> <p>#21 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 100' north of the stop bar along Brookridge Drive.</p> <p>#22 Install an R10-18 Photo Enforced sign approx 100' north of the stop bar along Brookridge Drive.</p>

# Examples of Other Municipalities ATESD Plans

- Consistent & Uniform Warning / Regulatory Sign Approach Across Connecticut Contrasts With Greenwich Which Fails For Several Reasons

**Pass**

Towns:  
 Middletown  
 Fairfield  
 New Haven  
 Beacon Falls  
 Washington  
 Milford  
 Stratford  
 Marlborough

**Marginal**

Towns:  
 Stamford

**FAIL....**

Towns:  
 Greenwich

Examples of these town ATESD plans are on the next four slides

**Municipal plans approved**


- Beacon Falls, CT - Approved November 24, 2025
- Fairfield, CT - Approved December 11, 2025
- Greenwich, CT - Approved July 7, 2025
- Marlborough, CT - Approved May 16, 2025
- Middletown, CT - Approved May 23, 2025 - Amended November 6, 2025
- Milford, CT - Approved October 17, 2025
- New Haven, CT - Approved October 17, 2025
- Stamford, CT - Approved January 7, 2026
- Stratford, CT - Approved September 23, 2025
- Washington, CT - Approved December 8, 2024
- Wethersfield, CT - Approved July 15, 2025

**Municipal plans submitted and under review\***

- Hamden
- Hartford
- West Hartford
- Winchester

\* Wethersfield excluded from this analysis because it appears their plan is for traffic signal cameras rather than speed cameras

Examples from other towns in CT that have the correct regulatory / warning signs from all approaches




Middletown Pass


1.3.2. School Zones

The following conditions must be met for the OSTA to approve an ATESD in a school zone:

- The location meets the definition of a school zone pursuant to [CGS 14-212b](#).
- The school zone has been approved by the appropriate statutory authority – either the OSTA or the [Local Traffic Authority](#).
- The school zone signage is consistent with Federal Highway Administration’s Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).



Fairfield Pass  
Beacon Falls, CT Pass



New Haven Pass



Greenwich signs are not consistent with FHA/MUTCD/OSTA requirements and approved plans and signs from other towns in CT


Examples of Proper Speed Limit Warning Signs That Are Consistent With Other ATESD Locations In Towns Across Connecticut and the CT DOT ATES Guide

Requirement: Signs Must Be Consistent And Uniform Across The State


New Haven Pass




Fairfield Pass



Fairfield Pass




Washington Pass



Focus on the sheer number of school zone and speed limit signs

Examples from other towns in CT that have the correct regulatory / warning signs from all approaches




Milford Pass

Greenwich signs are not consistent with OSTA / MUTCD requirements and approved plans and signs from other towns in CT


Stratford Pass





Marlborough, CT Pass



Washington, CT




Pass



West North Street ATESD Location Map

Stamford, CT



- Note:
- (1) Signs From All Approaches
  - (2) Correct Warning Signs Under Speed Limit Signs
  - (3) Proper Distances as Measured On The Map

"Speed Limit Photo Enforced" Signs Should Be Added As The Second Conspicuous Sign As Instructed Rather Than Traffic Laws – Refer to NTUTCD and CT DOT ATES Guide

Key:

- Sign
- Approximate ATESD Device Location
- School Zone Flasher

All existing speed limit signs will be revised to 25 MPH

Sign 31-0808 will cover the "when Flashing" as the base speed limit is 25 mph.

A Photo Enforced (R10-19P) plaque or a PHOTO ENFORCED (R10-19aP) word message plaque (see Figure 2B-32) may be mounted below a regulatory sign to advise road users that the regulation is being enforced by photographic equipment.



Pass



R10-19P





**“Speed Limit Photo Enforced” Is The Consistent And Uniform Approach Across The Entire Country, Not Just Connecticut  
A “Photo Enforced” Sign Underneath A Speed Limit Sign Is The Other Standard – Both Are Laid Out In CT DOT Instructions for ATESD’s  
Neither Exist in Greenwich**



Speed cameras on North Main Street in Marlborough. CREDIT: COURTESY / DAVID BUSEMEYER



Speed Cameras in New York City | WNYC

[Visit >](#)



NYC's lowered 20 mph speed limit the latest speed camera...

[Visit >](#)

Images may be subject to copyright. [Learn More](#)



City Hands Out 12,000+ Tickets in 10 Days After Installing Scho...

[Visit >](#)

Creator: Albany Times Unio... | Credit: Houston Chronicle ...



Representative Signs From Across The Country:  
Houston, Albany, NYC, Ohio, Georgia, Massachusetts, etc.

# MUTCD Requirements

In Connecticut, **MUTCD sign requirements for speed cameras on school zones** include the installation of conspicuous signs on all approaches to a school zone. These signs must be placed at a reasonable distance in advance of the speed camera to ensure visibility and compliance with safety standards. The Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT) ensures that all supplemental signing conforms to the MUTCD, including the specific requirements for school zone signs.

### Yes

Yes, all approaches to a school zone typically require notice. This is to ensure that road users are aware of the school area they are entering, which may include school buildings, grounds, crossings, or related activities adjacent to the highway. The use of signs like the School (S1-1) sign is common for this purpose, and they are used to warn road users of the presence of a school area or to identify the beginning of a designated school zone. Additionally, the S1-1 sign can be used to warn road users of a school crossing or to indicate the location of a school entrance.

Yes, school zone signs, including warnings and reduced speed limit signs, should be placed on all, or at least the primary, approaches to a school zone to ensure proper notice. The [Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices \(MUTCD\)](#) mandates that advance warning signs be used for each direction of traffic to alert drivers before they reach the designated school zone.

**Approach Requirements:** Signs must be placed to notify drivers approaching the zone from any direction, including from cross streets, to ensure awareness of the reduced speed limit.


**Sign Placement:** School zone signs (S1-1) are typically placed at the beginning of the zone, with, in some cases, advanced warning signs, as per the [CT.GOV-Connecticut's Official State Website](#).

**Distance:** Regulations suggest that in urban areas, these warnings signs should be placed roughly 250 feet in advance, while rural areas require up to 750 feet or more, depending on speed.

**Termination:** The end of a school zone must also be marked with an "END SCHOOL ZONE" sign or a standard speed limit sign, according to the Department of Transportation.



School Zone Sign



S1-1

S4-7P (optional)  
S4-3P (optional)

OR



W16-5P (optional)

OR



W16-6P (optional)



S4-5a

Source: [dot.gov](#)

**School Speed Limit signs required at the beginning of the zone (opposite the end zone) and visible from all approaches – Wrong signs, Wrong colors, Missing Signs**

**Sec. 14-212b. School zones. Fines doubled.** (a) As used in this section, “local highway” means a highway that is under the control of a town, city or borough; and “local traffic authority” means the traffic authority of a town, city or borough.

(b) (1) At the request of the legislative body of a town, city or borough, the Office of the State Traffic Administration may designate as a school zone any part of a state highway that is adjacent to school property or is, in the opinion of said office, sufficiently close to school property as to constitute a risk to the public safety under all the circumstances. At the request of such legislative body, the office may revoke any such designation. (2) A local traffic authority may designate as a school zone, and may revoke any such designation, any part of a local highway that is adjacent to school property or is, in the opinion of the local traffic authority, sufficiently close to school property as to constitute a risk to the public safety under all the circumstances.

(c) The Superior Court shall impose an additional fee equivalent to one hundred per cent of the fine established or imposed for the violation of the provisions of section 14-218a or 14-219, for any such violation committed in a school zone designated in a conspicuous manner by the Office of the State Traffic Administration or local traffic authority.

(d) The Office of the State Traffic Administration with regard to a state highway or the local traffic authority with regard to a local highway shall cause to be posted a sign approved by the Office of the State Traffic Administration (1) at the beginning of a school zone in each direction that traffic is permitted to flow which shall read as follows: “SCHOOL ZONE AHEAD FINES DOUBLED”, and (2) at the end of such zone in each direction that traffic is permitted to flow which shall read as follows: “END SCHOOL ZONE”.



*This sign is required in each direction that traffic is permitted to flow – It DOES NOT EXIST coming from Old Church Road – There is one 120 feet west of Old Church Road on East Putnam, but that’s not on all approaches*

*Furthermore, it does not exist AT the beginning of the school zone (either the old location of “end zone” or new location “end zone”) – It is also required beyond any major intersections (i.e. required East of Old Church)*

***These are the requirements of Sec. 14-212b. but they IGNORE the additional MUTCD requirements on colors and styles/signs/locations these signs must conform with and installed per the latest edition***

**Section 2B.25 Higher Fines Signs and Plaque (R2-6P, R2-10, and R2-11)**

**Standard:**

01 Except as provided in Paragraph 3 of this Section, if increased fines are imposed for traffic violations within a designated zone of a roadway, a BEGIN HIGHER FINES ZONE (R2-10) sign (see Figure 2B-3) or a FINES HIGHER (R2-6P) plaque (see Figure 2B-3) shall be used to provide notice to road users.

02 If an R2-10 sign or an R2-6P plaque is posted to provide notice of increased fines for traffic violations, an END HIGHER FINES ZONE (R2-11) sign (see Figure 2B-3) shall be installed at the downstream end of the zone to provide notice to road users of the termination of the increased fines zone.

**Option:**

03 The BEGIN HIGHER FINES ZONE (R2-10) sign or FINES HIGHER (R2-6P) plaque may be omitted where the higher fines zone is established by statute.

**Guidance:**

04 The BEGIN HIGHER FINES ZONE sign or FINES HIGHER plaque should be located at the beginning of the temporary traffic control zone, school zone, or other applicable designated zone and just beyond any interchanges, major intersections, or other major traffic generators.

**Section 7B.02 School Area Signs and Plaques**

**Support:**

01 Many state and local jurisdictions find it beneficial to advise road users that they are approaching a school that is adjacent to a highway, where additional care is needed, even though no school crossing is involved and the speed limit remains unchanged. Additionally, some jurisdictions designate school zones that have a unique legal standing in that fines for speeding or other traffic violations within designated school zones are increased or special enforcement techniques such as photo radar systems are used. It is important and sometimes legally necessary to mark the beginning and end points of these designated school zones so that the road user is given proper notice.

02 The School (S1-1) sign (see Figure 7B-1) has the following four applications:

- A. School Area – the S1-1 sign can be used to warn road users that they are approaching a school area that might include school buildings or grounds, a school crossing, or school related activity adjacent to the highway.
- B. School Zone – the S1-1 sign can be used to identify the location of the beginning of a designated school zone.
- C. School Advance Crossing – if combined with an AHEAD (W16-9P) plaque or an XX FEET (W16-2P or W16-2aP) plaque to comprise the School Advance Crossing assembly (see Figure 7B-1), the S1-1 sign can be used to warn road users that they are approaching a crossing where schoolchildren cross the roadway (see Section 7B.03).
- D. School Crossing – if combined with a diagonal downward-pointing arrow (W16-7P) plaque to comprise the School Crossing assembly (see Figure 7B-1), the S1-1 sign can be used to warn approaching road users of the location of a crossing where schoolchildren cross the roadway (see Section 7B.03).

## **Section 7B.05 School Speed Limit Signs and Plaques**

### **Standard:**


- 01 A School Speed Limit assembly (see Figure 7B-1) or a School Speed Limit When Flashing (S5-1) sign (see Figure 7B-1) shall be used to indicate the speed limit where a reduced school speed limit zone has been established based upon an engineering study or where a reduced school speed limit is specified for such areas by statute. The School Speed Limit assembly or School Speed Limit When Flashing sign shall be placed at or as near as practicable to the point where the reduced school speed limit zone begins (see Figures 7B-2 and 7B-4).
- 02 ~~If a reduced school speed limit zone has been established, a School (S1-1) sign shall be installed in advance~~ (see Table 2C-3 for advance placement guidelines) of the first School Speed Limit sign assembly or S5-1 sign that is encountered in each direction as traffic approaches the reduced school speed limit zone (see Figures 7B-2 and 7B-4).
- 03 Except as provided in Paragraph 4 of this Section, the downstream end of an authorized and posted reduced school speed limit zone shall be identified with an END SCHOOL SPEED LIMIT (S5-3) sign (see Figures 7B-1, 7B-2, and 7B-4).

The latest version of the MUTCD is nearly 1,200 pages – Let’s follow the guidelines, not pick and choose – Spend the time and energy to have clear signs before jumping immediately to 10+ speed camera locations

**Standard:**

- 05 **School warning signs, including the “SCHOOL” portion of the School Speed Limit (S5-1) sign and including any supplemental plaques used in association with these warning signs, shall have a fluorescent yellow-green background with a black legend and border unless otherwise provided in this Manual for a specific sign.**
- 06 **The signs used for school area traffic control shall be retroreflective or illuminated.**

Fluorescent Yellow-Green (FYG) signs are required for all new or replaced school zone, school crossing, and bus stop warning signs per the 2009 MUTCD (Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices) updates. They are optional but recommended for pedestrian, bicycle, and playground crossing signs to enhance visibility, but they are not mandatory for these non-school applications. Custom Products +3



**Key Details on FYG Sign Requirements:**

- **Mandatory Use:** School zone signs (S1-1), school speed limit signs (S5-1), and related, specific warning signs must use



*Improper: Uses wrong color and is not systematic with one color  
There is no vertical reflective strip  
These are at East Putnam and North Street*



*Proper: Consistent colors and vertical reflective strip  
These are at GCDS, ironically where there is no ATESD*

**Guidance:**

- 13 *When a fluorescent yellow-green background is used, a systematic approach featuring one background color within a zone or area should be used. The mixing of standard yellow and fluorescent yellow-green backgrounds within a selected site area should be avoided.*

**Standard:**

- 09 **Warning signs regarding conditions associated with school buses and schools and their related supplemental plaques shall have a black legend and border on a fluorescent yellow-green background (see Section 7B.01).**

Mixing standard yellow and fluorescent yellow green backgrounds on school warning signs within a zone or area shall be avoided. When school signs are replaced, use the fluorescent yellow green background for all School Signs within the zone or area.

*Warning Signs Must Meet MUTCD Requirements – For School Zones, Regulatory School Warning Signs Must Be Fluorescent Yellow Green  
(This Has Been The Standard For 15+ Years)*

All school warning signs, in addition to the following signs, are to have a fluorescent yellow green background:

**Standard:**

- 05 School warning signs, including the “SCHOOL” portion of the School Speed Limit (S5-1) sign and including any supplemental plaques used in association with these warning signs, shall have a fluorescent yellow-green background with a black legend and border unless otherwise provided in this Manual for a specific sign.
- 06 The signs used for school area traffic control shall be retroreflective or illuminated.



During the reviews, it was noted that there are currently posted speed limit signs within the proposed school zone limits. The existing speed limit signs will require relocation out of the school speed limit zone. It was also observed that the existing School Warning and School Entrance Ahead signs are not in compliance with the latest color standards contained in the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD) and should be upgraded in conjunction with the School Zone speed limit sign installations.

School Speed Limit When Flashing Sign



*These signs on East Putnam are not in the MUTCD (they are not standardized like R2-10) and do not meet the FYG requirement*

## Fluorescent Yellow-Green

### School Zone Ahead fines doubled be FYG?

Yes, school zone ahead fines doubled should be in **Fluorescent Yellow-Green (FYG)**. The use of FYG for school zone signs is mandated by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) to maximize visibility and reduce conflicts between vehicles and children. The color choice is effective in challenging conditions, such as dawn, dusk, and adverse weather, where visibility is compromised. The FHWA and MUTCD require that all school and bus stop signs be in FYG, ensuring that drivers are alerted to the presence of pedestrians, bicycles, and schools, signaling a vulnerable user environment.

⇒ dot.gov

### Section 1D.05 Color Code

Support:

- 01 The following color code establishes general meanings for 11 colors of a total of 13 colors that have been identified as being appropriate for use in conveying traffic control information.

**Standard:**

- 02 **The general meaning of the 13 colors shall be as follows:**
  - A. Black—regulation
  - B. Blue—road-user services guidance, tourist information, and evacuation route
  - C. Brown—recreational and cultural interest area guidance
  - D. Coral—reserved for future designation (see Paragraph 4 of this Section)
  - E. Fluorescent Pink—incident management
  - F. Fluorescent Yellow-Green—pedestrian warning, bicycle warning, playground warning, school bus warning, and school warning
  - G. Green—indicated movements or actions permitted and direction guidance

*These are the required signs for School Zone Ahead (and are found at many other schools in Greenwich and across CT)*

*Note: Greenwich submitted proposed school signage only in black-and-white thus the potential oversight. It is important to state that in the submission, there was no MUTCD sign number attached to “School Zone Ahead – Fines Doubled” for East Putnam as existed with all other signs and most other locations.*

**Section 2C.69 Photo Enforced Plaques (W16-10P and W16-10aP)**

Option:

01 A Photo Enforced (W16-10P) plaque or a PHOTO ENFORCED (W16-10aP) word message plaque (see Figure 2C-16) may be mounted below a warning sign to advise road users that the regulations associated with the condition being warned about (such as a traffic control signal or a toll plaza) are being enforced by photographic equipment.



W16-13P

Note: The background color (yellow or fluorescent yellow-green) shall match the color of the warning sign that it supplements.

**SUPPLEMENTAL WARNING PLAQUES**

**Section 2C.57 Use of Supplemental Warning Plaques**

Option:

01 A supplemental warning plaque (see Figure 2C-16) may be displayed with a warning or regulatory sign when engineering judgment indicates that road users require additional warning information beyond that contained in the main message of the warning or regulatory sign.



W16-10P



W16-10aP

**Standard:**

02 Supplemental warning plaques shall be used only in combination with and installed on the same post(s) as warning or regulatory signs. They shall not be mounted alone or displayed alone.

03 Unless otherwise provided in this Manual for a particular plaque, supplemental warning plaques shall be mounted below the sign they supplement.

"Shall not" is defined as "Must not" by Connecticut Law

**Section 2C.58 Design of Supplemental Warning Plaques**

**Standard:**

01 A supplemental warning plaque used with a warning sign shall have the same legend, border, and background color as the warning sign with which it is displayed. A supplemental warning plaque used with a regulatory sign shall have a black legend and border on a yellow background.

02 Supplemental warning plaques shall be square or rectangular.

### Section 7B.02 School Area Signs and Plaques

Support:

- 01 Many state and local jurisdictions find it beneficial to advise road users that they are approaching a school that is adjacent to a highway, where additional care is needed, even though no school crossing is involved and the speed limit remains unchanged. Additionally, some jurisdictions designate school zones that have a unique legal standing in that fines for speeding or other traffic violations within designated school zones are increased or special enforcement techniques such as photo radar systems are used. It is important and sometimes legally necessary to mark the beginning and end points of these designated school zones so that the road user is given proper notice.
- 02 The School (S1-1) sign (see Figure 7B-1) has the following four applications:
- A. School Area – the S1-1 sign can be used to warn road users that they are approaching a school area that might include school buildings or grounds, a school crossing, or school related activity adjacent to the highway.
  - B. School Zone – the S1-1 sign can be used to identify the location of the beginning of a designated school zone.
  - C. School Advance Crossing – if combined with an AHEAD (W16-9P) plaque or an XX FEET (W16-2P or W16-2aP) plaque to comprise the School Advance Crossing assembly (see Figure 7B-1), the S1-1 sign can be used to warn road users that they are approaching a crossing where schoolchildren cross the roadway (see Section 7B.03).
  - D. School Crossing – if combined with a diagonal downward-pointing arrow (W16-7P) plaque to comprise the School Crossing assembly (see Figure 7B-1), the S1-1 sign can be used to warn approaching road users of the location of a crossing where schoolchildren cross the roadway (see Section 7B.03).

Option:

- 03 If a school area or school zone is located on a cross street in close proximity to the intersection, a School (S1-1) sign with a supplemental arrow (W16-5P or W16-6P) plaque (see Figure 7B-1) may be installed on each approach of the street or highway to warn road users making a turn onto the cross street that they will encounter a school area soon after making the turn.

Standard:

- 04 If a school zone has been designated under State or local statute, a School (S1-1) sign (see Figure 7B-1) shall be installed to identify the beginning point(s) of the designated school zone (see Figure 7B-2).

### Section 7B.03 School Crossing Signs

Standard:

- 01 The School Advance Crossing assembly (see Figure 7B-1) shall consist of a School (S1-1) sign supplemented with an AHEAD (W16-9P) plaque or an XX FEET (W16-2P or W16-2aP) plaque.
- 02 Except as provided in Paragraph 3 of this Section, a School Advance Crossing assembly shall be used in advance (see Table 2C-3 for advance placement guidelines) of the first School Crossing assembly that is encountered in each direction as traffic approaches a school crosswalk (see Figure 7B-3).
- Option:
- 03 The School Advance Crossing assembly may be omitted (see Figure 7B-2) where a School Zone (S1-1) sign (see Section 7B.02) is installed to identify the beginning of a school zone in advance of the School Crossing assembly.
- 04 If a school crosswalk is located on a cross street in close proximity to an intersection, a School Advance Crossing assembly with a supplemental arrow (W16-5P or W16-6P) plaque may be installed on each approach of the street or highway to warn road users making a turn onto the cross street that they will encounter a school crosswalk soon after making the turn (see Figure 7B-3).
- 05 A 12-inch reduced size in-street School (S1-1) sign (see Figure 7B-1), installed in compliance with the mounting height and special mounting support requirements for an In-Street Pedestrian Crossing (R1-6 or R1-6a) sign (see Section 2B.20), may be used in advance of a school crossing to supplement the post-mounted school warning signs. A 12 x 6-inch reduced size AHEAD (W16-9P) plaque (see Figure 7B-1) may be mounted below the reduced size in-street School (S1-1) sign.

Standard:

- 06 If used, the School Crossing assembly (see Figure 7B-1) shall be installed at the school crossing (see Figures 7B-2 and 7B-3), or as close to it as possible, and shall consist of a School (S1-1) sign supplemented with a diagonal downward-pointing arrow (W16-7P) plaque (see Section 2C.63) to show the location of the crossing.
- 07 The School Crossing assembly shall not be used at crossings other than those adjacent to schools and those on established school pedestrian routes.
- 08 The School Crossing assembly shall not be installed on an approach controlled by a STOP or a YIELD sign except as provided in Paragraphs 9 and 10 of this Section.

## Section 7B.05 School Speed Limit Signs and Plaques

### Standard:

01 A School Speed Limit assembly (see Figure 7B-1) or a School Speed Limit When Flashing (S5-1) sign (see Figure 7B-1) shall be used to indicate the speed limit where a reduced school speed limit zone has been established based upon an engineering study or where a reduced school speed limit is specified for such areas by statute. The School Speed Limit assembly or School Speed Limit When Flashing sign shall be placed at or as near as practicable to the point where the reduced school speed limit zone begins (see Figures 7B-2 and 7B-4).

02 If a reduced school speed limit zone has been established, a School (S1-1) sign shall be installed in advance (see Table 2C-3 for advance placement guidelines) of the first School Speed Limit sign assembly or S5-1 sign that is encountered in each direction as traffic approaches the reduced school speed limit zone (see Figures 7B-2 and 7B-4).

03 Except as provided in Paragraph 4 of this Section, the downstream end of an authorized and posted reduced school speed limit zone shall be identified with an END SCHOOL SPEED LIMIT (S5-3) sign (see Figures 7B-1, 7B-2, and 7B-4).

### Option:

04 If a reduced school speed limit zone ends at the same point as a designated school zone (see Section 7B.02), an END SCHOOL ZONE (S5-2) sign may be used instead of an END SCHOOL SPEED LIMIT (S5-3) sign. A standard Speed Limit sign showing the speed limit for the section of highway that is downstream from the authorized and posted reduced school speed limit zone may be mounted on the same post above the END SCHOOL SPEED LIMIT (S5-3) sign or the END SCHOOL ZONE (S5-2) sign.

### Guidance:

05 *The beginning point of a reduced school speed limit zone should be at least 200 feet in advance of the school grounds or a school crossing; however, this 200-foot distance should be increased if the reduced school speed limit is 30 mph or higher. The maximum beginning point of a reduced school speed limit zone should not be greater than 500 feet in advance of the school grounds or a school crossing.*

### Standard:

06 The School Speed Limit assembly shall be either a static sign assembly, a blank-out sign, or a changeable message sign (see Chapter 2L).

## Section 7B.06 Higher Fines Zone Signs and Plaques in School Areas

### Support:

01 The signs and plaques used to inform road users of higher fines zones and their locations depend on whether the fines apply to all traffic violations or only to speeding violations. Their locations also depend on whether the higher fines zone begins and/or ends at the same point as the school zone or school speed limit zone. Figures 7B-4 and 7B-5 show examples of higher fines zones signing.

### Standard:

02 Where increased fines are imposed for traffic violations within a designated school zone:

A. A BEGIN HIGHER FINES ZONE (R2-10) sign (see Figure 7B-1) or a FINES HIGHER (R2-6P), FINES DOUBLE (R2-6aP), or \$XX FINE (R2-6bP) plaque (see Figure 7B-1) shall be installed as a supplement to the School Zone (S1-1) sign to identify the beginning point of the higher fines zone (see Figures 7B-4 and 7B-5); and

B. An END HIGHER FINES ZONE (R2-11) sign (see Figure 7B-1) or an END SCHOOL ZONE (S5-2) sign (see Figure 7B-1) shall be installed at the downstream end of the zone to notify road users of the termination of the increased fines zone (see Figure 7B-5).

03 If exceeding the speed limit is the only traffic violation that is subject to higher fines, a FINES HIGHER (R2-6P), FINES DOUBLE (R2-6aP), or \$XX FINE (R2-6bP) plaque shall be posted with the School Speed Limit (S5-1) sign and shall not be posted beneath the School Zone (S1-1) sign (see Section 7B.05).

04 If the portion of the roadway that is subject to higher fines does not begin at the location of the School Zone (S1-1) sign, a BEGIN HIGHER FINES ZONE (R2-10) sign shall be placed at the point where the higher fines begin (see Sheet 2 of Figure 7B-5).

### Option:

05 If a BEGIN HIGHER FINES ZONE (R2-10) sign is used downstream of the School Zone (S1-1) sign, a FINES HIGHER (R2-6P), FINES DOUBLE (R2-6aP), or \$XX FINE (R2-6bP) plaque may also be placed beneath the School Zone (S1-1) sign.

06 Where appropriate, one of the following plaques may be mounted below the sign that identifies the beginning point of the higher fines zone:

A. A S4-1P plaque (see Figure 7B-1) specifying the times that the higher fines are in effect,

B. A WHEN CHILDREN ARE PRESENT (S4-2P) plaque (see Figure 7B-1), or

C. A WHEN FLASHING (S4-4P) plaque (see Figure 7B-1) if used in conjunction with a yellow flashing beacon.

The Connecticut Department of Transportation (CT DOT) requires school zone ahead signs to be posted at the beginning and end of the school zone in each direction. These signs must read: "SCHOOL ZONE AHEAD FINES DOUBLED" at the beginning and "END SCHOOL ZONE" at the end. The signs must be approved by the Office of the State Traffic Administration (OSTA) and posted in compliance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). The signs should be placed at least 750 feet from the school zone in rural areas, 1,500 feet on faster roads, and 250 feet away in urban areas. The signs must be retroreflective yellow-green color sheeting to ensure visibility, especially at night or in poor weather conditions. [ct.gov](http://ct.gov)



Correct / Approved MUTCD Version

- 02 The School (S1-1) (see Figure 7B-1) has the following four applications:
- A. School Area – the S1-1 sign can be used to warn road users that they are approaching a school area that might include school buildings or grounds, a school crossing, or school related activity adjacent to the highway.
  - B. School Zone – the S1-1 sign can be used to identify the location of the beginning of a designated school zone.
  - C. School Advance Crossing – if combined with an AHEAD (W16-9P) plaque or an XX FEET (W16-2P or W16-2aP) plaque to comprise the School Advance Crossing assembly (see Figure 7B-1), the S1-1 sign can be used to warn road users that they are approaching a crossing where schoolchildren cross the roadway (see Section 7B.03).
  - D. School Crossing – if combined with a diagonal downward-pointing arrow (W16-7P) plaque to comprise the School Crossing assembly (see Figure 7B-1), the S1-1 sign can be used to warn approaching road users of the location of a crossing where schoolchildren cross the roadway (see Section 7B.03).


Standard:

- 02 Where increased fines are imposed for traffic violations within a designated school zone:
- A. A BEGIN HIGHER FINES ZONE (R2-10) sign (see Figure 7B-1) or a FINES HIGHER (R2-6P), FINES DOUBLE (R2-6aP), or SXX FINE (R2-6bP) plaque (see Figure 7B-1) shall be installed as a supplement to the School Zone (S1-1) sign to identify the beginning point of the higher fines zone (see Figures 7B-4 and 7B-5); and
  - B. An END HIGHER FINES ZONE (R2-11) sign (see Figure 7B-1) or an END SCHOOL ZONE (S5-2) sign (see Figure 7B-1) shall be installed at the downstream end of the zone to notify road users of the termination of the increased fines zone (see Figure 7B-5).

School Advance Crossing Assembly



THESE SIGNS "SHALL" BE INSTALLED →



[In Connecticut, "shall" is defined by law as "must"]

Given the requirements that school related signs be FYG in color, why would Greenwich choose to use an older black and white CT DOT version than the newer MUTCD FYG signs?

To be clear, sign S5-1 (CT) is NOT an MUTCD approved sign and thus not allowed by the ATESD statute as a warning sign

Standard:

05 School warning signs, including the "SCHOOL" portion of the School Speed Limit (S5-1) sign and including any supplemental plaques used in association with these warning signs, shall have a fluorescent yellow-green background with a black legend and border unless otherwise provided in this Manual for a specific sign.

06 The signs used for school area traffic control shall be retroreflective or illuminated.

CT DOT Sign Catalog (new)

S4-5a	41-2105	00 MPH School Zone Ahead	36	36	1	SL,ML	XI	Fluor Yel/Grn	
-------	---------	--------------------------	----	----	---	-------	----	---------------	--

CT DOT Sign Catalog (old)

S5-1 (CT)	31-2101	School Zone Ahead Fines Doubled	36	24	2	SL,ML	IX	White	
-----------	---------	---------------------------------	----	----	---	-------	----	-------	--

<https://portal.ct.gov/dot/-/media/dot/traffic-design/signcatalogpdf.pdf> -- Refer to Figure 7B-5 For The Correct MUTCD School Ahead / Fines Double Illustrations

**Figure 7B-4. Example of Signing for a School Zone with a School Speed Limit and Higher Fines Only for Speeding**




Figure 7B-5. Example of Signing for a School Zone with Higher Fines for All Traffic Violations (Sheet 1 of 2)

A – Higher fines zone begins at the beginning of the school zone





Figure 7B-5. Example of Signing for a School Zone with Higher Fines for All Traffic Violations (Sheet 2 of 2)

B – Higher fines zone begins after the beginning of the school zone



# School Zone Information Guide



## LEGISLATION:

### Statutory Definition (C.G. S Section 14-212b):

- (1) At the request of the legislative body of a town, city or borough, the Office of the State Traffic Administration (OSTA) may designate as a school zone any part of a state highway that **is adjacent to school property** or is, in the opinion of said office, **sufficiently close to school property as to constitute a risk to the public safety** under all the circumstances. At the request of such legislative body, the office may revoke any such designation.
- (2) A local traffic authority (LTA) may designate as a school zone, and may revoke any such designation, any part of a local highway that **is adjacent to school property** or is, in the opinion of the local traffic authority, **sufficiently close to school property as to constitute a risk to the public safety** under all the circumstances.

## SCHOOL AREA:

- School signs are pentagon shaped and fluorescent yellow/green in color. They can be supplemented with an optional "Ahead" or "School" subplate.
- These signs are **warning, not regulatory**.
- They are typically used to advise road users that they are approaching a school area or a marked school crosswalk, but their presence does not automatically mean that there is a school zone.
- These signs are also used in conjunction with a reduced school speed limit (OSTA has purview on all public roads).



## SCHOOL ZONE WITH REDUCED SPEED LIMIT:

- This is an overlay zone with two speed limits.
  - One in effect during specific school days & hours.
  - One in effect during all other hours (background speed limit).
- OSTA has jurisdiction for all speed limits on public roads.
- **On State roads**, School Zone speed limit signs **MUST** have flashers. The flashers are installed and paid for by the municipality under an encroachment permit.
- **On Municipal roads**, the signs can be static or have flashers.
- "School Zone Ahead - Fines Doubled" signs are required when the speed limit is reduced. "End School Zone" signing is also required.



## APPLYING FOR A SCHOOL ZONE WITH REDUCED SPEED LIMIT:

- Review the [CT School Zone Checklist](#)
- Contact your [Local Traffic Authority](#).
  - The LTA should then submit an [Application for Approval of Speed Limits](#) to DOT.OSTA@ct.gov which includes the City/Town, road, school name & designation (elementary, middle, or high school), and time frame for speed reductions (typically 2 hours in AM & 2 hours in PM).
- If your school is on a state road:
  - After the LTA submits the application, OSTA will then determine whether a School Zone designation is appropriate given the characteristics of the road.

Find more information about Safe Routes to School  
at [ct.gov/saferoutes](http://ct.gov/saferoutes)



# When Children Are Present Standard

**“When children are present” has been defined narrowly for children within crosswalks, waiting at the curb or present along the roadway – Greenwich PD should not state enforcement will only be active when “children are present” if that’s not the case**



Photo speed cameras will be active and enforced on days that school is in session, children are present and when the school zone beacons are flashing. These cameras will detect individual vehicles speeding in school zones. If you are traveling through High School during school hours, these cameras will be active enforcing appropriate enforceable speed limit.

Those caught will be sent warnings (for the applicable cameras in the warning period) by mail to the address the vehicle is registered but no fine will be assessed yet. For the cameras in the citation period, the citations will be mailed to the address the vehicle is registered.

\* Initial violation: \$50

\* Each subsequent violation: \$75

We look forward to the community’s support in keeping kids safe as they return to school, and we know that together, we can save lives. Working together, we can achieve our Vision of ZERO: Zero crashes, Zero injuries, and Zero fatalities.

For more information or inquiries, please contact Sgt. James Smith at [james.smith@greenwichct.gov](mailto:james.smith@greenwichct.gov) or call 203-622-8015.

The term "when children are present" in school zones refers to the legal requirement for drivers to reduce their speed due to the presence of school-aged children. This applies when children are walking within marked crosswalks, waiting at the curb, or present along the roadway. The MUTCD does not define this term, but it is clarified in the Washington Administrative Code, indicating that it can apply during school hours or even during recess periods. Additionally, some signs may specify that the speed limit is in effect "when flashing," which means that even if children are not visible, the speed limit is still in effect. [The Wise Drive](#) +2



*This ordinance was passed by stating it would only be enforced when children are present, which is reiterated on the Greenwich town website. Note: When children are present AND school zone beacons are flashing is the requirement.*

*There are NO children present in ANY of the speed camera photos shown as evidence*

*Furthermore, there were NO children present at ~7:20am in the morning on East Putnam – walking within crosswalks, waiting at the curb, or present along the roadway*



Event: 01180200114772241721337 Unit: FX1253 Date: 2023JAN04 Time: 07:20:21.369 Direction: Proceeding Lane: 2  
 Lbl: FL1227 Speed Limit: 25 MPH OPA: GPD Location: 14115



Event: 01180200114772241721337 Unit: FX1253 Date: 2023JAN04 Time: 07:20:24.172 Direction: Proceeding Lane: 2  
 Lbl: FL1227 Speed Limit: 25 MPH Vehicle Speed: 46 MPH Vehicle Range: 253 FT OPA: GPD Location: 14115

**Several states have similar definitions of “when children are present”**

While precise wording can vary by local municipality, law enforcement generally interprets “present” according to these criteria:

- **Physical Proximity:** Children are on a roadway, sidewalk, or school grounds adjacent to the street.
- **Potential Hazard:** Children are close enough to motorized traffic that their presence constitutes a safety risk.

*This is the reasonable interpretation of guidance from Greenwich*



*No children present... flashing beacons not visible*



Steady\_Habits\_CT • 5d ago

At North St School, no child is EVER near the road. Parents block the street at the start and end of school so one could never go the speed limit at those time.

These cams are just another political stunt that taxes police resources as they have to sort through all the data. It would be more effective just to post a police car in front of the school. At least that would get the cops away from their desks and into the community.

↑ 2 ↓

*Greenwich school zone speed cameras are operational during school hours **when children are present** and when the school zone beacons are flashing. These cameras enforce speed limits and are active on days that school is in session. Greenwich, CT | Official Website*



**If this policy is wrong, the town and police department need to first correct the record on their own websites before they can enforce it**

Here's what the Town of Greenwich, CT publicly states about when school zone speed cameras are in effect on East Putnam Avenue at Greenwich High School, along with direct sources:

### 📌 Official Town Information (Greenwich Police / Town of Greenwich)

#### ✅ Activation Conditions

According to the Town of Greenwich's official *School Speed Cameras* page, the automated cameras (including the one on East Putnam Avenue at Greenwich High School) are active and enforced when all of the following are true:

- School is in session (i.e., regular school days)
- Children are present
- The school-zone beacons/flashing lights are activated

This means the cameras are enforcing the school-zone speed limit *only during times when the beacons are flashing on school days* — not 24/7. greenwichct.gov

🔗 Source (Town of Greenwich official page):

→ <https://www.greenwichct.gov/3072/School-Speed-Cameras> greenwichct.gov

### 🕒 Typical Enforcement Time Window (Reported in local coverage)

According to *Greenwich Free Press*, the broader school speed camera program — including Greenwich High School — is generally described as operating Monday through Friday during school hours, roughly 7:00 am to 4:00 pm, though the precise activation is tied to posted beacons and children being present rather than a strict clock. Greenwich Free ...

🔗 Source (Greenwich Free Press coverage of program)

→ <https://greenwichfreepress.com/police-fire/greenwich-high-school-now-included-in-speed-camera-program-241451/> Greenwich Free ...

### 📌 Key Takeaways

- The East Putnam Avenue / Greenwich High School camera is enforced on school days when beacons are flashing and students are present. greenwichct.gov
- Local reporting notes the program runs Monday–Friday during typical school hours (e.g., ~7 am–4 pm) unless beacons dictate otherwise. Greenwich Free ...
- Cameras are *not active when school is not in session* and the beacons are off. greenwichct.gov

# Greenwich Wise

*Greenwich Wisdom*

**School Safety vs Speed Trap?** Residents are increasingly frustrated by the "always-on" nature of the system. Many assumed that "no flashing lights = no camera," but that isn't the case. While the cameras enforce the lower 20 mph speed limit when beacons are flashing, they remain active from 7am to 4pm to enforce the "normal" speed limit (typically 30-35 mph) while school is in session. While the town justifies this as a protective measure for students on campus all day, critics argue that all-day operations feel more like revenue-generating surveillance than a targeted safety initiative.

*Now it's a bait and switch – Tickets being issued even when children are not present*

*But we can't even look up the Ordinance 14-52(a)(i) because it isn't on the website yet –*

*The only information on the Greenwich website states it will only be enforced when children are present*

## **Critical take on "big brother" control:**

*"I can never understand how people just willingly accept more big brother control without any pushback."*  
— Opposes perceived government overreach in enforcement. Reddit

*ATESD's (speed cameras) were supposed to be used in school zones – The question of when and where is unanswered and unclear given conflicting instructions and guidance and signs*

# Inadequate Public Notice

*Lack of adequate public notice contradicts the Act/Ordinance*

*Failure of thorough public relations / outreach*

*No press releases on the town website*

*Nothing shows up when you search the town website*

*No press releases on the police website*

*Even worse, misleading press releases that enforcement is delayed*

Useful Police Department Categories

<p><b>Mission Statement, General Information, and History of the the Greenwich Police Department</b></p> <p><b>Greenwich Police Command Structure</b></p> <p><b>Professional Standards and Accreditation</b></p> <p><b>Patrol Division</b></p> <p><b>Detective Division</b></p> <p><b>Support Services Division</b></p>	<p><b>General Services Division</b></p> <p><b>Animal Control &amp; Adoption</b></p> <p><b>Officer Commendations and Officer Complaints</b></p> <p><b>Community Events and Programs</b></p> <p><b>Community and Police Partnerships (CAPP)</b></p> <p><b>Women's Self-Defense Classes</b></p> <p><b>Dark House Checklist</b></p> <p><b>Home Security and Business Surveys</b></p>	<p><b>Public Information</b></p> <p><b>Fingerprinting and Permits</b></p> <p><b>Domestic Violence Prevention</b></p> <p><b>Protecting Children On-Line</b></p> <p><b>Identity Theft</b></p> <p><b>Greenwich Police Extra Duty Hiring Procedures</b></p> <p><b>Social Media Policy</b></p>
---	--	---

[Home](#) > [Government](#) > [Departments M - Z](#) > [Public Works](#) > [Services](#) > [Campaigns and Initiatives](#) > Traffic and Pedestrian Safety Community Input

## Traffic and Pedestrian Safety Community Input

### Attention

The traffic and pedestrian safety community input form will be open to the public until May 30, 2024.

### About this Initiative

The Town of Greenwich Department of Public Works (DPW), in conjunction with the Traffic and Pedestrian Safety Task Force (Greenwich Police, Fire, Planning and Zoning, and Parking Services departments), is hosting a series of public meetings based on neighborhood location to gain valuable public input on traffic and pedestrian safety. To accommodate the public and effectively collect community feedback throughout town, there will be five neighborhood-specific hybrid night meetings and an additional daytime meeting that will encompass all areas of town. If you cannot attend any meeting, please fill out the form provided, below.

*Public comment ended in 2024 for DPW Community Input*

[Home](#) > [Government](#) > [Departments M - Z](#) > [Police](#) > Public Information

## Public Information

[Limited English Proficiency & Language Assistance Plan](#)

[Crime Reporting Tip Lines](#)

[Department Contact Information](#)

[Employment Opportunitites](#)

[Parking Tickets](#)

[Useful Links](#)

[Unclaimed Property](#)

**FAIL...**

*No public information on Greenwich CT police department website*

*Lack of adequate public notice*

- At least 30 days before an ATESD is operational, the municipality shall develop and implement a public awareness campaign for the following:
  - Educating the public about the importance of obeying speed limits and traffic signals; and,
  - The imminent use of an ATESD in the municipality


*The reason I ask whether there was a public awareness campaign is because Sgt. Smith said “The speed camera program has created an immense amount of inquiries for us to sort through”*

*If it were clearly understood through a campaign, compliance would be significantly higher, and there would not be as many inquiries.*

*Also – The Town of Greenwich Ordinances have not even been updated to reflect either the existence of Chapter 14, Article VI – OR – ordinance 14-52(a)(i)*

*No Town Press Releases Since 2023*

*The Last Press Release From Greenwich PD showed a halt of the camera program*



This is the last press release on speed cameras from Greenwich PD

**FAIL...**

# Greenwich Police Announce Delay of Automated Photo Speed Camera Program

By: GREENWICHFREEPRESS | October 3, 2025

X Post

Email Print

Update: On Friday afternoon, Oct 3, Greenwich Police announced that the launch of the speed camera program is delayed, and new dates have not yet been finalized.

Police said they will follow up with updated information once the official start dates have been determined.

“In the meantime, please disregard the previously stated timeline,” police said, apologizing for any confusion this error may have caused.

Original Press release from Greenwich Police, Oct 2, 2025:

The Greenwich Police Department in conjunction with the Town of Greenwich will be launching an automated photo speed enforcement program at the Central Middle School, Glenville School, Greenwich Academy, Greenwich High School, Parkway School, North Street School, Brunswick Lower School and Eagle Hill School.

No other mention of ATESD rollout, timelines, locations, anything that would be helpful in notifying the public on the police website

**FAIL...**

## Police

2 news items

### Preventing Financial Scams Among Connecticut Seniors

The FBI's Internet Crime Complaint Center (IC3) received 859,532 complaints in 2024, with losses reported at \$16.6 billion, a 388% increase from 2023. In 2024, "false pretense" scams cost Connecticut victims an...

Police

Posted on November 20, 2025



### New Legal Update on E-Bikes

Dear Greenwich Residents,

As electric bicycles (e-bikes) continue to grow in popularity across our town and the state, new laws have gone into effect to promote safer and more...

Police

Posted on October 01, 2025



## Lack of adequate public notice contradicts the Act/Ordinance

### Code of Ordinances

Supplement 122 - 7-2025

Online content updated on December 19, 2025

MUNICIPAL CODE Town of GREENWICH, CONNECTICUT Codified through Representative Town Meeting of September 15, 2025. (Supp. No. 122, 7-2025)

[VIEW WHAT'S CHANGED](#)

This Code of Ordinances and/or any other documents that appear on this site may not reflect the most current legislation adopted by the Municipality.

Where is the **publication** of the ordinances enacted by legislative body or at town meeting as required?

There is no public record of the Town Ordinance or even Chapter 14, Article VI

- CHAPTER 14. VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC.
  - ARTICLE 1. - TOWN PROPERTY.
  - ARTICLE 2. - TRAFFIC AND PARKING REGULATIONS.
  - ARTICLE 3. - SNOW EMERGENCY REGULATIONS. **FAIL...**
  - ARTICLE 4. - PENALTY.
  - ARTICLE 5. - SCHEDULES.
- CHAPTER 15. UTILITIES.

First Selectman Camillo said even though this was new business and the Board typically does a second read he did not see a reason for it because it was something that had to be done and they didn't want to hold this up. Heavey said they had not received any reply from the project on this program and noted there was no opposition to the approval last year of the use of the devices and it had been reported in all the media then. Heavey said the public hearing was required to fulfill a requirement in the State application.

Under the advice of Town Attorney Barbara Schellenberg the Board decided they had to formally close the public hearing before voting on the request itself.

Selectwoman Rabin made a motion to close the public hearing. It was seconded by Selectperson Stone McGuigan and was approved unanimously.

Selectwoman Rabin made a motion to approve the Town of Greenwich's Automated Traffic Enforcement Safety Device Plan for 10 school zones. It was seconded by Selectperson Stone McGuigan and was approved unanimously.

7. Public comment period

No public comments were made.

who specifically and at what meeting was the greenwich CT ordinance 14-52(a)(i) passed by the selectmen?

I searched for information on a "Greenwich, CT ordinance 14-52(a)(i)", but all of the available \*\*Greenwich municipal code sources I could find online do *not* show any section numbered 14-52(a)(i) in the Town of Greenwich Code of Ordinances. The available municipal code listings, including the Greenwich codified ordinances, do not contain a heading or index entry corresponding to "14-52" that is specific to Greenwich; the closest results were general municipal code portals and unrelated references. [Municode Library](#)

Here's what can be said based on the research so far:

### **✘ No Record of "Ordinance 14-52(a)(i)" in Greenwich Code Available Publicly **FAIL...****

- I could not locate the text of an ordinance titled "14-52(a)(i)" in the Town of Greenwich's municipal code as published online (e.g., through Municode or the official Greenwich Code of Ordinances). The code is organized by chapters on topics like *Veterans*, *Selectmen*, *Ordinances*, etc., but there isn't a public entry matching that specific citation. [Municode Library](#)

**Sec. 7-157. Publication. Referendum. Publication of summary.** (a) Ordinances may be enacted by the legislative body of any town, city, borough or fire district. Any such ordinance so enacted, except when enacted at a town or district meeting, shall become effective thirty days after publication thereof in some newspaper having a circulation in the municipality in which it was enacted, provided, upon a petition of not less than fifteen per cent of the electors of such municipality filed with the town or borough clerk, as the case may be, within thirty days after the publication of such ordinance, asking that the same be submitted to the voters of such municipality at its next regular or special meeting, it shall be so submitted and in such event shall not become effective unless a majority of the voters voting at such meeting vote in favor thereof. Any ordinance enacted at a town or district meeting shall become effective fifteen days after publication thereof in some newspaper having a circulation in such town or in such district, as the case may be. Cities and other municipalities whose charters provide for the manner in which they may enact ordinances may enact ordinances in such manner.

(b) Whenever any town, city, borough or fire district is required to publish any proposed ordinance or ordinance in accordance with subsection (a) of this section, the legislative body of such town, city, borough or fire district may provide that a summary of such proposed ordinance or ordinance shall be published in lieu of such proposed ordinance or ordinance, provided that, in any case in which such a summary is published, the clerk of such town, city, borough or fire district shall make a copy of such proposed ordinance or ordinance available for public inspection and shall, upon request, mail a copy of such or proposed ordinance or ordinance to any person requesting a copy at no charge to such person. Any summary so published shall bear a disclaimer as follows: "This document is prepared for the benefit of the public, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation. This document does not represent the intent of the legislative body of (here insert the name of the town, city, borough or fire district) for any purpose." The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to any proposed ordinance or ordinance which makes or requires an appropriation.

*Inadequate public relations and public input / comment / notice period:*

*Despite the precedent, this was pushed through without adequate public input – There was no second read in 2025 (they relied on April 2024 discussion) – They rushed it through and relied on OLD media rather than adequate public relations or press releases to gather public comment before they voted to approve it.*

# Public Feedback / Criticism

- Due Process Concerns – Significant Burden on the Innocent
- Unreliability / Failure To Abide With Plan
- Public Outcry
- Constitutional Issues

**There is broad public opposition to speed cameras in Greenwich**


*Demonstrably untrue comment by Camillo that there was no opposition to the proposal the prior year – There were plenty of people that spoke out publicly against it They were not given a chance to give public input or feedback before the final 2025 vote.*

As for speed cameras, which were discussed earlier in the day at the Selectmen meeting and an RFP for a vendor to study locations and install/monitor them, starting in school zones, Fassuliotis said she vehemently opposed them.

“I personally do not favor traffic cameras in town. As a New England Yankee our personal freedoms are paramount,” Fassuliotis said.

The I-Team saw the same talk and started digging. Our research revealed something interesting, mentioned in a Board of Selectmen meeting on June 5th. Before giving his speed enforcement camera update, First Selectman James Brinton told the board, “this has not been a smooth rollout.” He went on to say the camera where Neri got her ticket was having problems, according to the vendor. “They’re struggling with the technology. The units that were up, they’re now all replacing them because they are losing connectivity.”

More than two thousand citations have been rejected since the cameras went live in May. “For either not lining up, maybe you can’t see the plate right away. If I’m not too sure on the plate, if it’s blurred, we’re not going to issue a ticket,” says Officer Innaimo. He says sometimes the computer reads a number wrong. He admits, “mistakes do get made, but we’ll gladly look at every one of them.”

Public reaction to Greenwich, CT's new school zone speed cameras has been mixed, with town officials reporting that many residents are "upset" and frustrated about receiving tickets, while officials emphasize public safety and the need for compliance. Thousands of violations were reported in the first few months of the program, which began in late 2025. 

**Local Online Comments & Resident Sentiments (2025 – early 2026)**

Online residents discussing the cameras around Greenwich expressed opposition that reflects local pushback:

- 2. Anonymous commenter on Reddit (general Greenwich sentiment)**  
“Fuck those cameras. One thing that you learn from China.”  
— Strongly critical reaction to the installation of cameras. Reddit
- 3. Resident on Newark-style quote (Reddit-based comment)**  
“Just another way to tax us.”  
— Characterizing enforcement as a financial burden rather than a safety tool. Reddit
- 4. Commenter from local threaded discussion**  
“It [speed cameras] feel more like revenue-generating surveillance than a targeted safety initiative.”  
— Reflects sentiment that enforcement is overly broad. GreenwichWise
- 5. Another local commenter from Reddit thread**  
“At North St School, no child is EVER near the road ... These cams are just another political stunt...”  
— Criticizing camera placement and purpose. Reddit
- 6. Same Reddit thread – opposition to how system works**  
“Having cops sit behind a screen and sort through thousands of tickets ... is worse than doing nothing!”  
— Complaints about enforcement logistics and perceived inefficiency. Reddit

[Laughing all the way to the bank? — Christopher Fountain](#)  
15 Comments

**Civil infraction enforcement loophole avoids accountability for the actual violator and is a major burden on the innocent**

*There is an inherent injustice and lack of accountability with charging the owner of a vehicle rather than the operator of the vehicle. This penalizes the owner rather than the operator and does not adequately serve as a penalty or deterrent for the person that actually violated the ordinance. With a parking ticket or speeding ticket from an officer, you know immediately who was driving and it can correct/change behavior. With a speed camera ticket that comes 30-60 days after the fact, with an "intentional lag" in the process, it's impossible to correct bad behavior or protect children in real time and harder to prove your innocence when not at fault.*

*What if someone else was driving my car?*

*If someone else was driving your vehicle at the time the image was captured, you are still responsible for the fine as the owner of the vehicle, according to the DOT.*

(2) that the owner of a motor vehicle commits a violation of the ordinance if the person operating such motor vehicle (A) exceeds the posted speed limit by ten or more miles per hour and such operation is detected by an automated traffic enforcement safety device, or (B) fails

vehicle. The citation shall include the following: (A) The name and address of the owner of the motor vehicle; (B) the number plate of the

**FAIL...**

**Due Process Is Backwards In This Situation**

- *Is there an appeal process? Yes.*
- *Is there a right to question your accuser? Sort of...*
- *Is this a fair procedure? Absolutely not...*
- *Did the government provide justifications? No*

*It's guilty until proven innocent without any real presumption of innocence and the burden of proof is shifted to the owner/defendant because it's civil rather than criminal. And the bar for the little amount of time (per ticket) it takes to review and send out 17,000 tickets vs. the massive amount of time and effort to prove your innocence is completely one-sided and unjust. Moreso with the ability to send out multiple citations to the same innocent person that need to be defended.*



**East\_Glass\_4874** • 2mo ago

Instead of warnings you should be ticketing and or arresting offenders. Drivers are not punished and it really shows all over.

Several states and specific municipalities have banned or terminated speed camera programs, primarily driven by concerns over public privacy, constitutional rights, the "revenue grab" nature of the fines, and public backlash. [↗](#)

#### States with Statewide Bans

According to the National Conference of State Legislatures and other reports, the following states prohibit the use of speed cameras: [↗](#) [Hilton Head Sun](#) [+1](#)

- **Maine**
- **Mississippi**
- **New Hampshire**
- **New Jersey** (Prohibits speed cameras, though previously allowed red-light cameras)
- **South Carolina**
- **Texas** (Signed into law in 2019, which also banned red-light cameras)
- **West Virginia**
- **Wisconsin** (Prohibits speed radar cameras) [↗](#) [Hilton Head Sun](#) [+3](#)

#### Key Rationale for Statewide Bans:

- **Constitutional Concerns:** Many opponents argue that cameras violate the Sixth Amendment right to confront one's accuser (as there is no human officer to cross-examine).
- **Revenue vs. Safety:** Critics frequently argue these programs are "cash registers on a pole" rather than safety measures.
- **Accuracy Issues:** Reports of malfunctioning cameras or inaccurate readings have fueled distrust.
- **Rear-end Accidents:** In Texas, studies suggested red-light cameras actually increased rear-end collisions. [↗](#) [The General Insurance](#) [+2](#)

#### Municipalities and Local Action

Even in states where they are legal, some local governments have acted to restrict or remove them: [↗](#)

- **Windsor, Connecticut (2026):** The Town Council voted 9-1 to shut down 16 Flock Safety license plate reader/speed cameras due to resident privacy concerns and potential use by federal agencies for immigration enforcement.
- **New Orleans, Louisiana (2025):** Stopped issuing tickets via speed cameras outside of specific school zones following new state restrictions.
- **Kent, Connecticut (2025):** Voters rejected a proposal to purchase speed cameras in a referendum.
- **Ohio Counties/Townships (2025):** A state budget bill included a ban on speed cameras in certain townships, affecting areas like the village of Peninsula.
- **Iowa Cities (2024):** Following a state legislative overhaul, the Iowa DOT ordered the shutdown of many municipal speed cameras, particularly those on primary highways/interstates, although battles over local road usage continue.
- **Historically (2000s-2010s):** Citizens in cities such as **Chillicothe (OH)**, **Cincinnati (OH)**, **College Station (TX)**, and **Sulphur (LA)** voted to ban cameras, often with over 70% approval, according to the [National Motorist Association](#). [↗](#)

#### Rationale for Local Bans/Opposition

- **Privacy Rights:** High surveillance concerns (e.g., license plate tracking).
- **Disproportionate Impact:** Concerns that fines fall disproportionately on lower-income residents or people of color.
- **Lack of Evidence:** Some officials, such as in Falls Village, CT, found that traffic studies did not justify the high cost of the technology, citing that speeding was more "perception than reality".
- **False Sense of Security:** Residents in some areas have reported that while cameras slow traffic at the exact location, they encourage faster speeding elsewhere once

## *Speed Cameras have been tried throughout the country – Many states are now ending the practice given unreliability, over-reach, public outcry, and Constitutional issues*

*Unconstitutional when it violates equal protection clause:*

*Different treatment for people violating the same ordinance depending on the mechanism of enforcement (whether they are stopped by a police officer or an ATESD).*

## **Arizona City Council Ends Speed Camera Contract, Marking Shift in Enforcement Strategy**

The vote signals a historic shift in Arizona's approach to automated enforcement, aligning Avondale with a growing statewide movement to reexamine the balance between safety, privacy, & public trust.

#### Constitutional Violations and Due-process Concerns

Traffic-enforcement cameras undermine constitutional protections. Automated enforcement replaces law-enforcement officers with machines, presuming guilt and issuing citations without proper due process. Such systems violate the **Fourth Amendment**, which protects against unreasonable searches and seizures, as these devices capture data without warrants or individualized suspicion. They also undermine the **Fifth** and **14th Amendments**, which guarantee due process and equal protection under the law, by removing context and discretion from enforcement.

Additionally, these laws often carve out exemptions for government workers, farmers, or utility employees — creating unequal application of the law. Such carveouts erode the rule of law and undermine public trust, especially as some push for "equity" in speed-camera enforcement.

#### States Reversing Course

Several Chicago suburbs are beginning to dismantle their red-light camera programs — a welcome step toward transparency, accountability, and limited government. Gurnee, Illinois, recently scrapped its system after **16 years**, citing declining revenue and persistent delays from the Illinois Department of Transportation, which left many cameras offline for extended periods. Other towns, including Hanover Park and Palatine, Illinois, faced similar setbacks, with revenue from fines plummeting as they waited months or even years for state approval to reactivate devices or certify new vendors.

While red-light cameras have generated more than \$1.56 billion in fines across Illinois since 2008, municipalities have stated they have **failed to improve traffic safety** and, in some cases, contributed to an increase in crashes. Their removal reflects growing public skepticism, particularly in light of past scandals involving corruption and backroom deals tied to camera contracts. By eliminating these surveillance tools, local governments are backing away from predatory enforcement schemes and moving toward more constitutionally sound approaches to traffic regulation.

Outsourcing enforcement to private, for-profit companies undermines due process and removes accountability from law enforcement. Privacy concerns are mounting, as third-party operators often control surveillance equipment and personal data collected from motorists. While proponents claim these systems enhance public safety, research is mixed, and programs across the country have been dismantled due to **public backlash** and **legal challenges**. Growing resistance reflects deeper concerns about the privatization of policing and erosion of constitutional protections — especially when profit motives replace the rule of law.

*"State legislatures are increasingly enacting laws to expand automated traffic-enforcement systems – including speed, red-light, and noise-detection cameras – under the pretense of enhancing public safety without adding more law-enforcement personnel. However, these measures – embraced in states such as Hawaii, Iowa, Kentucky, Virginia, and Washington – violate constitutional protections guaranteed by the Fourth, Fifth, and 14th Amendments by expanding government surveillance and prioritizing revenue generation over individual liberty, due process, and the principles of limited government."*

# Appendix

Greenwich may never see red light cameras, given current state rules. Heavey said just one or two signals in town would qualify for red light cameras based on the number of accidents at intersections and that the department is not looking at using them at this time.

## Outstanding Questions

Why would Greenwich allow Blue Line to choose/select/help with camera placements? Chief Heavey testified to that. The OSTA submission also states that it was created with assistance from Blue Line. Blue Line faced (and settled) class action lawsuits and has a host of complaints.

Why didn't Greenwich DPW / Police / Traffic Section / Community have primary responsibility for the site selection?

Does Blue Line get paid a transaction fee for every ticket? That's a perverse incentive to over-enforce and over-ticket rather than reduce speeding and explains a) so many enforcement zones and b) cameras installed where there is a history of few accidents or violations

Does Blue Line get paid (and paid first) like other CT vendors whether or not the tickets get paid or hold up against appeals?

Why would Greenwich contract with a vendor that had never worked with another town in CT?

Presumably Blue Line isn't as familiar with CT rules and regulations and approaches as local police which may lead to mistakes in the plan design or implementation (which was demonstrably/certainly the case)

The 90% cited reduction in speeding presumably is by locals that are "in the know" – For instance, North Street dropped from 4,341 violations to 107 violations the next month according to public statements – How many of those 107 live out of town and were unaware of the speed cameras? On a related note, the warning violation numbers don't correspond to the traffic surveys statistically

How can you claim that speeding dropped 90% after the first month of warnings, but then there were 17,000 violations in January? That defies common sense and contradicts the claim above - Does that imply 170,000 warnings were given out?

Which one is it? 100 violations or 1,000+ violations per zone in the month after warnings? Can't be both at the same time...

Is there a multi-year commitment with Blue Line? Even if the program isn't working, is overturned or not producing the intended outcome?

Where are the detailed monthly statistics and public transparency on the violations that were promised?

Mistake of law and mistake of fact can happen – But repeated negligence and failure of duty of care negate that defense

### D. SITE CRASH HISTORY

There are no reported vehicle crashes in this school zone.

<b>Speed Limit</b>	<b>35 mph</b>
Average Speed	34 mph
50 <sup>th</sup> Percentile Speed	35 mph
85 <sup>th</sup> Percentile Speed	42 mph
Max Speed	103 mph

(8:00 AM - 2:00 PM)		
Vehicle Count	Speeders	% Speeding
1,629	44	2.7%
1,537	58	3.8%
1,552	47	3.0%
1,448	41	2.8%
1,636	57	3.5%
<b>7,802</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>3.2%</b>

### E. TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT DATA

Lower Cross Rd from 150' east of Lake Avenue easterly to 1215' east of Lake Avenue

\*Parkway School had zero traffic stops on Lower Cross Rd.

\*There was only 1 crash on Lower Cross Road. The site of the crash was not near the school zone of Parkway School.

To the extent that more speed camera sites are used than necessary, or signs are missing, or tickets are too time consuming to fight, or Blue Line puts up unclear or non-conforming signs, the more it benefits Blue Line but the more it harms safety – That's their financial incentive and evidence shows they do what is in their best interest

The Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States states, in part:

1: ... nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; *nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.* (emphasis added)

#### Second Arizona Jurisdiction Rejects Speed Camera Tickets

Maricopa County, Arizona judge cancels all speed camera tickets issued within his jurisdiction.

Another Arizona jurisdiction has joined Pinal County in refusing to accept photo radar ticketing. Arrowhead Justice Court Judge John C. Keegan in December issued an order declaring the state's freeway photo radar program unconstitutional. Since then, Judge Keegan has torn up at least 400 state-issued tickets because these tickets carry penalties that differ from those issued by a live police officer.



Judge John Keegan

"The clear meaning of these provisions of the Arizona and United States constitutions is that it is unconstitutional to create one set of laws that applies only to a particular class of defendant and not to other defendants based solely on the mechanism employed by the government," Keegan ruled. "Given the not uncommon set of circumstances where two drivers are traveling on the same highway, at the same speed in excess of the speed limit, at the same time, in essentially the same location and are cited by the same agency into the same court, [the freeway photo radar statute] ARS 41-1722 creates a distinction whereby one class of defendant is subjected to a significantly different array of penalties than another class of defendant based solely on the use of photo enforcement."

Keegan is an elected justice of the peace for Maricopa County. His court has jurisdiction over north Glendale, Peoria, Sun City and Surprise. Any driver contesting a freeway speed camera ticket within this jurisdiction will have the \$181 fine automatically dismissed.

"It is the determination of this court that the provisions of ARS 41-1722 are unconstitutional and unenforceable within the jurisdiction of this court," Keegan concluded.

Keegan was an Arizona state representative in 1991 when residents of Peoria voted by a two to one margin to eject speed cameras from the city. Keegan later was elected Peoria's mayor, a post he held until 2007. The statewide speed camera program operated by Redflex currently has the authority to issue photo radar tickets in Peoria on the Loop 101 freeway, despite the public's strong opposition. CameraFraud.com's Tucson affiliate praised Keegan for taking a stand.

"Finally, a judge with common sense who follows the Constitution," wrote CameraFraud Tucson organizer Bill Conley.

The clear meaning of these provisions of the Arizona and United States constitutions is that it is unconstitutional to create one set of laws that applies only to a particular class of defendant and not to other defendants based solely on the mechanism employed by the government. Given the not uncommon set of circumstances where two drivers are traveling on the same highway, at the same speed in excess of the speed limit, at the same time, in essentially the same location and are cited by the same agency into the same court, ARS § 41-1722 creates a distinction whereby one class of defendant is subjected to a significantly different array of penalties than another class of defendant based solely on the use of photo enforcement.

Now, therefore, it is the determination of this court that the provisions of ARS § 41-1722 are unconstitutional and unenforceable within the jurisdiction of this court.

December 9, 2008

((seal))

(original signed)

**The Honorable John C. Keegan**

*Note: These were civil penalties as well Privileges and Immunities Clause cited*

*Those who would give up essential Liberty, to purchase a little temporary Safety, deserve neither Liberty nor Safety”*

*Benjamin Franklin*

*[Not intended in the actual historical Penns context but rather the modern usage]*

In January 2026, Greenwich, CT issued a total of 7,225 school speed camera violations. Additionally, there are 9,537 pending violations for review that may increase the total number of violations for the month.

*The speed limits are clearly unreasonable if ~17,000 drivers (approximately half the driving population of the entire town of Greenwich, CT) are cited with violations in a single month and there have been virtually no injuries.*

*How much time does it take for police officers to accurately review enough videos to actually send out 17,000 violations a month? 30 seconds apiece assuming 100% of them are accurate?*

# Liberty

102 languages

Article Talk

Read Edit View history Tools

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

*For other uses, see Liberty (disambiguation).*

**Liberty** is the state of being free within society from oppressive restrictions imposed by authority on one's way of life, behavior, or political views.<sup>[1]</sup> The concept of liberty can vary depending on perspective and context. In the [Constitutional law of the United States](#), [ordered liberty](#) means creating a balanced society where individuals have the freedom to act without unnecessary interference ([negative liberty](#)) and access to opportunities and resources to pursue their goals ([positive liberty](#)), all within a fair legal system.

Sometimes liberty is differentiated from freedom by using the word "freedom" primarily, if not exclusively, to mean the ability to do as one wills and what one has the power to do; and using the word "liberty" to mean the absence of arbitrary restraints, taking into account the rights of all involved. In this sense, the exercise of liberty is subject to capability and limited by the rights of others. Thus liberty entails the [responsible](#) use of freedom under the [rule of law](#) without depriving anyone else of their freedom. Liberty can be taken away as a form of punishment. In many countries, people can be deprived of their liberty if they are convicted of criminal acts.

Liberty's [etymology](#) is from the Latin word *liber*, from Proto-Italic *\*louderos*, from Proto-Indo-European *\*h<sub>1</sub>léwdʰeros*, from *\*h<sub>1</sub>lewdʰ-* ('people') (thus cognate to archaic English *lede* meaning 'man, person').<sup>[2]</sup> The word "liberty" is commonly used in slogans or quotes, such as in "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness" from the [United States Declaration of Independence](#),<sup>[3]</sup> and France's national motto "*Liberté, égalité, fraternité*".<sup>[4]</sup>



*Liberty Enlightening the World* (known as the [Statue of Liberty](#)), by sculptor Frédéric Auguste Bartholdi, was donated to the US by France in 1886 as an artistic personification of liberty.

CFS #	Drop	Actual Call Type	Date	Time	Location	Unit ID	Primary Officer
180041378	02	MVA WITH INJURIES	12/01/19	10:17	TEMPLE SWALOM 300 E PUTNAM AVE GREENWICH	DFA	Weller, Christopher

*Over 50,000 vehicles drive along East Putnam each week and during the last six (6) years (1/1/19 through 12/31/24) only one (1) motor vehicle accident with injuries was identified in that vicinity? That's 15 million drivers and the solution is to give out 17,000 tickets a month? For one injury case you identified in that vicinity? (Note: there may be a handful of others but the locations were redacted in the OSTA submission). There were only 19 school days in January – That's nearly 1,000 tickets per school day? Over 100 tickets for every hour of the school day? One ticket every 30 seconds? Can they even be accurately reviewed in 30 second? Does that sound reasonable or necessary? Do we even know if it was speed-related? We've been told that a minority of accidents are actually speed-related in the proposal. That's an incredibly low probability.*

*Note: Data taken from Site Crash History and Blue Line ADT Counts in OSTA Submission*

“Civil enforcement is an unjust loophole to skirt due process requirements” (similar to Civil Asset Forfeiture)

## Civil forfeiture in the United States

🗺️ 1 language ▾

Article Talk

Read Edit View history Tools ▾

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

In the United States, **civil forfeiture** (also called civil **asset forfeiture** or civil judicial forfeiture)<sup>[1]</sup> is a process in which **law enforcement officers** take **assets** from people who are suspected of involvement with crime or illegal activity without necessarily charging the owners with wrongdoing. While **civil procedure**, as opposed to **criminal procedure**, generally involves a dispute between two private citizens, civil forfeiture involves a dispute between **law enforcement** and *property* such as a pile of cash or a house or a boat, such that the thing is suspected of being involved in a crime. To get back the seized property, owners must prove it was not involved in criminal activity. Sometimes it can mean a threat to seize property as well as the act of seizure itself.<sup>[2]</sup> Civil forfeiture is not considered to be an example of a **criminal justice financial obligation**.

Proponents see civil forfeiture as a powerful tool to thwart criminal organizations involved in the **illegal drug trade**, since it allows authorities to seize cash and other assets from suspected narcotics traffickers. They also argue that it is an efficient method since it allows **law enforcement agencies** to use these seized proceeds to further battle illegal activity, that is, directly converting value obtained for law enforcement purposes by harming suspected criminals economically while helping law enforcement financially.

Critics argue that **innocent owners** can become entangled in the process to the extent that their **4th Amendment** and **5th Amendment** rights are violated, in situations where they are presumed guilty instead of being **presumed innocent**. It has been ruled unconstitutional by a judge in South Carolina.<sup>[3][4]</sup> Further, critics argue that the incentives lead to corruption and law enforcement misbehavior. There is consensus that **abuses** have happened but disagreement about their extent as well as whether the overall benefits to society are worth the cost of the instances of abuse. <sup>[citation needed]</sup>

Civil forfeitures are subject to the "excessive fines" clause of the **U.S. Constitution's 8th amendment**, both at a federal level and, as determined by the 2019 Supreme Court case, *Timbs v. Indiana*, at the state and local level.<sup>[6]</sup> A 2020 study found that the **median** cash forfeiture in 21 states which track such data was \$1,300.<sup>[6]</sup>

*“Sometimes a law is just on its face and unjust in its application”*

*Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. – Letters from Birmingham Jail*



*Q: What is your duty as a citation hearing officer (or a judicial review if it gets that far) if the ordinance or citation/violation is unjust?*

*A: Throw it out in the interest of justice and accountability*

## Yes

### Can a jury throw vote to not convict if the law is unjust?

Yes, a jury can nullify the law if they believe it is unjust. This is known as jury nullification and occurs when a jury returns a not guilty verdict despite believing the defendant has broken the law. The jury acts as the "conscience of the community," placing justice above the strict letter of the law. This power is not explicitly granted but is recognized as a legal principle. Jury nullification is not illegal, and jurors cannot be punished for their decision, even if they openly admit to nullifying the law.

- *I wasn't driving and I don't know for sure who was*
- *Inadequate signs*
- *Signs in the wrong place*
- *Missing signs*
- *Obstructed signs*
- *Incorrect enforcement times published*
- *Inadequate public relations effort (required)*
- *Unjust civil penalty on owners rather than violators*

*Speed limits are unreasonably low – They fall well below the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile which is what most drivers perceive their speed to be safe and reasonable*

*“Close” enough only counts in horseshoes and hand grenades*

*I strongly advise the town of Greenwich to proactively review all of the new ATESD locations for similar issues* 81

*If lower speed limits don't reduce speeds or accidents and aren't the safest (most reasonable) speed limits... Then what can speed cameras be other than for a money grab?*



## Proper Posting of Speed Limits

Road Safety Brief - 2024-3

What is speeding, and why is the posting of proper speed limit signs important?

### Questions & Answers

#### Won't lowering the speed limit reduce speeds?

NO. Studies show that there is little change in the speed pattern after the posting of a speed limit. The driver is much more influenced by the roadway conditions.

#### Will lowering the speed limit reduce accident frequency?



NO. Although lowering the speed limit is often seen as a cure- all in preventing crashes, this is not the case. Crashes are most often the result of driver inattention and driver error. If a posted speed limit is unrealistically low, it creates a speed variance (i.e., some drivers follow the speed limit while most drive at a reasonable speed). This speed variance can contribute to crashes.

## HOW DOES THE CT OSTA DETERMINE THE REGULATORY SPEED LIMITS?

Radar speed observations are an important part of the traffic investigation. When choosing a speed, drivers take many roadway environment factors into consideration. Therefore, the speed that many people consider prudent is an important value. Data is collected and the 85th percentile speed is determined. This is the value indicating the speed at which most (85%) drivers are travelling at or below. Experience has shown that a posted speed limit near this value is the safe and reasonable speed. However, there are exceptions (high accident frequency, volumes, etc.). Engineering judgement is a very important tool. The traffic investigator must use knowledge of nationally accepted principles combined with experience to assign the safe speed.

*If UConn T2 and OSTA report that lowering speed limits doesn't reduce speeds... and won't reduce accidents... and that "experience has shown that a posted speed limit near the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed is the safe and reasonable speed" – Why are we not following their common-sense approach?*

*Ironically, changes in speed limits and excessively or unrealistically low speed limits can cause more accidents.*

*How Washington, CT deals with the "intentional lag" of tickets – Fairness when multiple tickets are issued before notice is made*

"You have 20 days to appeal the ticket from the time that you get it. It tends to be a 5-6 week process," says Kehoe.

Kehoe says they aren't trying to punish anyone and in fact, sometimes he'll give people a break. For example, when looking at citations, the system will tell Kehoe if someone already has one and when it was sent out. If the time between the two is short, say three days or so, he won't issue the second.

"The US Mail system takes time. The last thing I want to do is have someone get a second citation, unless it's something egregious," says Kehoe. He wants to give people the chance to change their driving. "We just don't want to sit there and be punitive and charge people for something they don't even realize they've done yet."

## Number Of Residents 'Upset' With Speed Camera Tickets, Camillo Says

An initial violation is \$50, with each subsequent violation costing speeders \$75.

 Richard Kaufman, Patch Staff

Posted Fri, Jan 9, 2026 at 12:44 pm ET

Police noted an "intentional lag" between when violations occur and when citations are issued due to the daily review process.

The department said it planned to share speed camera data monthly on its website, along with other call-for-service information for public consumption.



We've hit a snag. Sorry, but there is not a web page matching your entry.

You entered: <https://www.greenwichct.gov/m/newsflash/home/detail/3022>

[Return to the home page](#)



*I'm an advocate and activist for safety... But let's follow the right steps... and get the right feedback first...*

- Publicize the extent of the safety problem and the need for innovative solutions.
- Allow for due process. Minimize the number of days between the violation and citation issuance. **FAIL...**
- Regularly meet with the advisory committee and media to review program status and sustain public support.
- Consider other changes, including roadway design improvements, in order to reduce opportunities for unsafe driving. **FAIL...**
- Hold a kickoff event with advisory committee members. Introduce a well-developed and sustained public education campaign focused on improving safety by changing driver attitudes and behavior.
- Publicize changes, including new camera locations. Reinststate the probationary period before ticketing begins at new locations. **FAIL...**



*Slow Down... We seem to have missed or skipped several of these key first steps...*

*The last public engagement mentioned on the Greenwich PD Traffic Section website is 20+ Years Old*

**Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) FAIL...**

In 2004 and 2006 The Greenwich Police Department conducted a Residents' Survey, which identified traffic issues as a major concern for residents throughout the Town of Greenwich. In an effort to address these traffic issues, the Greenwich Police Department Traffic Section initiated the Selective Traffic Enforcement Program, better known as STEP, to target specific areas throughout the Town of Greenwich having the highest incidence of collisions.

**FIRST STEPS**

- Identify problem intersections and roadways.
  - Assess violation and crash data.
  - Conduct field observations.
  - Collect resident and roadway user input. **FAIL...**
- Consider what role automated enforcement should play as part of a comprehensive traffic safety strategy. **FAIL...**
- Make any engineering or signage changes needed to improve drivers' compliance with the law.
  - Ensure the road geometry conforms with guidelines from the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, National Association of City Transportation Officials guidance or state road design manuals, as appropriate.
  - Remove sightline obstructions of signals and signage. **FAIL...**
- For red light cameras:**
  - Ensure that yellow light timing conforms to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and Institute of Transportation Engineers guidelines.
- For automated speed enforcement:**
  - Ensure the speed limit is appropriate and accounts for all road users. Follow guidance and use tools from the Federal Highway Administration, Institute of Transportation Engineers, and the National Association of City Transportation Officials.
  - Ensure the speed limit is appropriate for special conditions, such as work zones and school zones.
  - Assess whether engineering changes could be made to promote compliance with the speed limit.
  - Ensure adequate posting of speed limits.
- Establish an advisory committee comprised of stakeholders. **FAIL...**
  - Consider including law enforcement, transportation department employees, victim advocates, equity and civil rights advocates, school officials, community residents, first responders, health officials and the courts.
  - Outline the committee's role. This may include developing guiding principles related to safety, equity, and transparency, as well as other aspects of the program.
  - Ensure committee meetings are open to the public and deliberations are transparent. **FAIL...**
- Meet with the media, including newspaper editorial boards, to build support and educate the public. **FAIL...**

# The Connecticut General Assembly

## OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH

Room 5300  
Legislative Office Building  
Hartford, CT 06106-1591

(860) 240-3400  
FAX (860) 240-3881  
olr@po.state.ct.us



May 6, 1994 94-R-0274

TO:  
FROM: James J. Fazzalano, Principal Analyst  
RE: School Warning Signs

You asked what process must be followed for municipalities to erect street signs that warn of school areas and school crossing areas and whether there are any requirements that these signs be of a standard form.

### GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOL SIGNS

State law requires that a municipal traffic authority erect and maintain "suitable warning signs" on highways under its jurisdiction indicating the presence of a school in the area and showing the proximity of the schoolhouse. These signs must be legible from 100 feet away and located a "reasonable" distance from the school. All new or replacement signs must conform to the specifications of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) as approved and revised by the State Traffic Commission (STC) (CGS § 13a-120). The MUTCD is a national set of guidelines and standards for all types of traffic control devices, including street signs, that federal law requires the states to follow so that traffic signs and signals will be uniform throughout the country to the maximum extent possible.

Each municipality must have a legal traffic authority. This can be one of several entities, depending on the type of municipality and local charter requirements. If a municipality has a board of police commissioners, the law specifies that this is the local traffic authority. If the municipality has no police commission, but has a regularly appointed police force, the law specifies that the legal traffic authority can be the city or town manager, the chief of police, the superintendent of police, or any legally elected or appointed official or board, or any official having similar powers and duties. If the municipality has no regularly appointed police force, the legal traffic authority would be the board of selectmen (CGS § 14-297). The legal traffic authority exercises control over streets and highways that are under local jurisdictions. The STC is the legal traffic authority for state highways.

The law authorizes local traffic authorities to place and maintain traffic control signals, signs, markings, and other safety devices upon highways under their jurisdictions. All such devices must conform to STC regulations and, by implication therefore, to the MUTCD (CGS § 14-298).

### STATE TRAFFIC COMMISSION GOVERNING REGULATIONS

Under STC regulations, traffic control signs generally fall into one of three classes: (1) regulatory signs, which give notice of traffic laws or regulations (e.g., Stop, Yield, and speed limits); (2) warning signs, which call attention to conditions on or adjacent to a highway that are potentially hazardous to traffic operations; and (3) guide signs, which show route designations, destinations, directions, services, points of interest, and other geographical, recreational, or cultural information. School signs are considered to be warning signs.

There are two types of school warning signs. One is called a school advance sign and warns motorists that a school is coming up on the road ahead. The other is a school crossing sign which designates points along the street where children will be crossing to get to or from the school. The regulations require that school advance and school crossing signs be in the shape of a pentagon with the point upwards. No other sign can have this appearance (Conn. Agencies Regs. § 14-298-507(h)). STC regulations also specifically require that the sign background be only yellow and the symbols and border be black (Conn. Agencies Regs. § 14-298-554(a)(11)).

The STC regulations also establish numerous general requirements for all signs, including things like the height at which they must be posted, requirements for reflectorization or illumination that shows the same shape as the sign actually is, and mounting at right angles to the road and facing the traffic they are intended to serve.

The regulations specify that warning signs should be placed at certain minimum distances in advance of the condition they are intended to warn about. In rural areas, this must be 750 feet. On high-speed roads and particularly on freeways, this must be as much as 1,500 feet or more. Where speeds are "relatively low" in urban areas, the advance distance should be only about 250 feet (Conn. Agencies Regs. Sec 14-298-555).

### FURTHER STANDARDIZATION THROUGH THE MUTCD

The MUTCD contains a special section dealing with traffic controls in school areas. The purpose of this section is to provide a comprehensive guide to officials that is meant to be applied as a national standard. Because the State Traffic Commission bases its traffic control regulations and policies on the MUTCD, it functions as the uniform standard for Connecticut. We have attached the sections of the MUTCD that deal with the rationale for uniform controls in school areas, the sizes and specifications for signs and pavement markings, and the guidelines for crossing supervision. We have not included the part relating to traffic signals in school areas since that did not relate directly to your question, but this can be provided if you will find it useful.

The technical specifications for the signs include things like form, color, content, placement, and location with respect to the school. School advance signs should generally be between 150 and 700 feet in advance of the school or school crossing.

*Note: This OLR/CGA guidance remains online and published at CGA.CT.GOV, however CARS 14-298-555 was repealed in December 1999. I don't have enough information to confirm whether or not the specific distance requirements below are now valid or not – But it is certainly established precedent for uniformity. 14-298 still requires standardization and uniformity. 14-298 places the requirement on OSTA – "office shall adopt and cause to be printed for publication regulations establishing a uniform system of traffic control signals, devices, signs and markings" – They may have either failed to formally update (establish) and publish a uniform distance requirement for signs or alternatively this may remain the current guidance.*

**An urban area is a densely populated human settlement with developed infrastructure, including cities, towns, and suburbs, where most people work in non-agricultural sectors.**

### Classification

The definition of an urban area can vary by country. For example, in the United States, settlements with **2,500 or more inhabitants** are considered urban, while in Japan, the threshold is **30,000 inhabitants**. In

FAIL...

FAIL...

FAIL...

*I'm formally requesting whistleblower protections and eligibility to avoid continued harassment and retaliation including but not limited to the release of this presentation – I reserve all rights*

### Civil Disobedience Explained

Civil disobedience is when people purposely break a law they feel is unfair to push for changes. This peaceful way of protesting assumes some laws don't match up with what's morally right or human rights, and therefore, shouldn't be followed.

Those who take part in civil disobedience know they might face legal trouble, but they're ready for it. They're willing to face the consequences to show how strongly they believe in their cause and to point out the wrong they see.

Civil disobedience isn't new; it has helped many groups push for changes in laws and policies by getting the public's attention and making people think about right and wrong. For example, the Civil Rights Movement used civil disobedience to fight racial segregation, and it worked – laws changed, and society made progress.

Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress, except that in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in such officer's judicial capacity, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable. For the purposes of this section, any Act of Congress applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a statute of the District of Columbia.

If you are a law enforcement officer or other government employee who has witnessed police officers committing one or more of these violations, you may want to report the activity but fear doing so will endanger your job, work relationships or career. Know that you have options: **whistleblower laws protect you against retaliation for reporting these incidents.**

In particular, 42 U.S.C. §1983, part of the Civil Rights Act of 1871, protects whistleblowers from retaliation by public officials for disclosing constitutional violations, including police brutality, to the press, a city council and other public bodies. Section 1983 is one of the most powerful whistleblower laws, providing the right to a jury trial, injunctive relief, and all economic damages, including compensatory damages and punitive damages.

*“An individual who breaks a law that conscience tells him is unjust... in order to arouse the conscience of the community over its injustice, is in reality expressing the highest respect for the law.”*


*Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. – Letters from Birmingham Jail*

The screenshot shows the top portion of a webpage from the U.S. Department of Justice, Criminal Division. The header includes the DOJ logo, the text "Criminal Division U.S. Department of Justice", and navigation links for "Our Offices", "Find Help", and "Contact Us". A search bar is located on the right. Below the header is a dark navigation bar with menu items: "About", "Initiatives", "Corporate Enforcement", "Cyber Security", "International", "Publications", "Press Room", "Report Crime", and "Cor". The breadcrumb trail reads: "Justice.gov > Criminal Division > Report Crime > Criminal Division Corporate Whistleblower Awards Pilot Program". The main heading is "Criminal Division Corporate Whistleblower Awards Pilot Program". There is a "Share" button with a right-pointing arrow. The text below explains the program: "The Department of Justice's Criminal Division has launched a Corporate Whistleblower Awards Pilot Program to uncover and prosecute corporate crime. Under this pilot program, a whistleblower who provides the Criminal Division with original and truthful information about corporate misconduct that results in a successful forfeiture may be eligible for an award." To the right of this text is an image of a police badge. Below the text, it states: "As described in more detail in the program guidance, the information must relate to one of the following areas: (1) certain crimes involving financial institutions, from traditional banks to cryptocurrency businesses; (2) foreign corruption involving misconduct by companies; (3) domestic corruption involving misconduct by companies; or (4) health care fraud schemes involving private insurance plans." At the bottom, it says: "If the information a whistleblower submits results in a successful prosecution that includes criminal or civil forfeiture, the whistleblower may be eligible to receive an award of a percentage of the forfeited assets, depending on considerations set out in the program guidance. If you have information to report, please fill out the intake form below and submit your information via [CorporateWhistleblower@usdoj.gov](mailto:CorporateWhistleblower@usdoj.gov). Submissions are confidential to the fullest extent of the law."

### Police Whistleblower Protection and the Blue Code of Silence

The "Blue Code of Silence" is an unofficial oath among police officers that discourages them from reporting fellow officers' misconduct. This culture of silence can lead to a lack of accountability and transparency within police departments, allowing officers to continue their patterns of misconduct without facing consequences. The lack of whistleblower protection in law enforcement makes it difficult for officers to come forward and report abuses of power, which is crucial for maintaining public trust and integrity in policing. [↔ National Whistleblower Center](#)

## Overlay of Crashes With School Zones




Fatal Injuries in Greenwich from the OSTA submission do not generally occur in school zones, during school hours, or with children involved

Furthermore, the fatal crash in a school zone was not caused by speeding

Note Causes: Older pedestrians, Dark conditions, Substance-impairment, Heavy truck off-ramp – Yet this document was used to justify the ATESD’s

### Fatal Crashes from 2015-2018

- US-1 (West Putnam Avenue) near Pemberwick Road - Older pedestrian fatal crash under dark conditions.
- NY-120A (King Street) and Anderson Hill Road - Pedestrian fatal crash.
- US-1 (East Putnam Avenue) and Hillside Road - Pedestrian fatal crash, involving a substance-impaired motorist.
- Milbank Avenue - Older pedestrian fatal crash.
- US-1 (West Putnam Avenue) and Western Jr Highway - Pedestrian fatal crash.
- Arch Street and I-95 (Connecticut Turnpike) off-ramp - Angle, heavy truck fatal crash.




Greenwich, Connecticut: Traffic Stop History\*

Year	Number of Traffic Stops	% Speed Related
2019	8359	27.73%
2020	4205	36.93%
2021	5614	40.97%
2022	6001	30.88%
2023	7495	29.59%

\*Per Greenwich Police Department Profiling Stats and Speed Related Stops Reports

*Similar Conclusion With 2017-2021 Data Points  
From National Roadway Safety Strategy  
Very Little Overlap Or Correlation To School Zones*



**Eagle Hill School**

Site #2 – Just **four** motor vehicle stops over 6 years  
~10+ million cars drove by during that time period

E. TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT DATA

Glennville Rd from Calhoun Dr. to 400 ft east of Brookside Dr.

Run Date: 01/17/2025 Greenwich Police Department Page 1 of 1  
Run Time: 12:04 Case Incident Report 14-218A

CFS #	Disp	Actual Call Type	Date	Time	Location	Unit Id	Primary Officer
2400005535	09	MV STOP	02/21/2024	11:29	54 GLENNVILLE RD, GLENNVILLE	D56	Caldwell, Steven
2400001530	09	MV STOP	01/15/2024	10:20	49 GLENNVILLE RD, GLENNVILLE	00	Hendrie, Daniel
2300008268	09	MV STOP	02/25/2023	11:25	48 GLENNVILLE RD, GLENNVILLE	D56	Caldwell, Steven
2200003592	09	MV STOP	11/14/2022	20:17	54 GLENNVILLE RD, GLENNVILLE	E55	Caldwell, Steven

**Central Middle School**

Site #4 – Just **one** motor vehicle stop over 6 years **FAIL...**  
~4 million cars drove by during that time period

E. TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT DATA

Orchard Street at Indian Rock Lane and extends to Coachlamp Lane

Run Date: 01/15/2025 Greenwich Police Department Page 1 of 1  
Run Time: 14:10 Case Incident Report 14-218A

CFS #	Disp	Actual Call Type	Date	Time	Location	Unit Id	Primary Officer
2200005122	08	MV STOP	02/20/2022	17:32	219 ORCHARD ST, GREENWICH	E58	Ferry, Dennis

**Parkway School**

Site #4 – Just **one** crash and not near the school zone  
~2 million cars drove by during that time period

There was only 1 crash on Lower Cross Road. The site of the crash was not near the school zone of Parkway School. **FAIL...**

E. TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT DATA

Lower Cross Rd from 150' east of Lake Avenue easterly to 1215' east of Lake Avenue

\*Parkway School had zero traffic stops on Lower Cross Rd. **FAIL...**

**Central Middle School**

Site #3 – **Zero** reported crashes over 6 years and only three stops  
~4+ million cars drove by during that time period

D. SITE CRASH HISTORY

**There are no reported vehicle crashes in this school zone.** **FAIL...**

E. TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT DATA

Indian Rock Ln between Stanwich Road and Orchard Street

Run Date: 01/17/2025 Greenwich Police Department Page 1 of 1  
Run Time: 14:13 Case Incident Report

CFS #	Disp	Actual Call Type	Date	Time	Location	Unit Id	Primary Officer
2100018723	08	MV STOP	07/06/2021	10:01	9 INDIAN ROCK LN, COS COB	D55	Arlington, Allen
2000003464	09	MV STOP	01/30/2020	18:30	CENTRAL MIDDLE SCHOOL 9 INDIAN ROCK LN, COS COB	E50	Carrino, Ryan
1900035539	09	MV STOP	10/18/2019	13:04	9 INDIAN ROCK LN, COS COB	D54	Tonga, Brian

**Greenwich Academy**

Site #6 – Just **two** motor vehicle stops over 6 years **FAIL...**  
~4 million cars drove by during that time period

1. E. TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT DATA

N. Maple 200' north of Maple Avenue northerly to Jofran Lane.

Run Date: 01/15/2025 Greenwich Police Department Page 1 of 1  
Run Time: 14:40 Case Incident Report 14-218A

Unit Id	Primary Officer
E50	Caldwell, Steven
D44	Pesce, Alan

How do these sites possibly justify using speed cameras?

Were these school zones selected by Blue Line Solutions merely to generate revenue and then “rubber stamped” by Greenwich and OSTA despite no obvious justification or need?

Heavey said camera placement was determined with help from Blue Line Solutions, a firm that installs and maintains traffic enforcement technology. Blue Line conducted traffic studies and reviewed historic crash and enforcement data to pick the school zones with the most speeders. **FAIL...**

If these school zones were dangerous for our children, then why weren't officers making motor vehicle stops? Why weren't there significant crashes?

Begs the question – How do these particular school zones warrant the installation of speed cameras / ATESD's? It doesn't seem to meet the very basic requirement or promises and assurances made by the Town of Greenwich or Greenwich PD to be used selectively

While allowed by statute to work with vendors, Greenwich abdicated its responsibility by outsourcing the traffic studies and the review of historical crash/enforcement data and using that as the basis for selecting where speed cameras would be placed.

**There is a clear and obvious conflict of interest – Blue Line Solutions is a for-profit business** that has been sued repeatedly for deceptive trade practices, over-billing, faulty equipment, and **they have settled class action lawsuits over unjustified tickets**. Their interests are not aligned with ensuring safety, their interests are to maximize tickets (and speed camera locations) rather than to solve the underlying problem.

At the very least, there is no evidence of any oversight or pushback against several clearly unjustified locations based on the underlying data and lack of a) widespread speeding, b) fatalities, c) motor vehicle accidents, d) traffic enforcement actions / motor vehicle stops - by the town, police department, or OSTA. While OSTA requires ongoing updates and compliance reports, it could take 12-24 months for those OSTA reviews to analyze whether the program has achieved its goals and is following its plan. In the meantime, there is an injustice for everyone that gets a ticket that is unwarranted.

This inconsistency is the exact reason why other states have overturned their speed camera locations – The sites were not chosen with respect to a history of speeding – Several Greenwich ATESD locations have no significant history of speeding, accidents, or motor vehicle stops

So while there isn't a verbatim transcript in the news articles, *multiple official news reports summarize Chief Heavey's statements* to the Board of Selectmen and the public that:

- **Blue Line Solutions conducted traffic studies** and review of historical crash/enforcement data, and
- **That work was the basis for selecting the school zones where speed cameras would be placed.**

The traffic surveys presented do not suggest a widespread pre-existing speeding problem at several speed camera locations

How do these sites possibly justify using speed cameras?

★ Chief Heavey Statements to Selectmen / Public

1. Chief Heavey told the Board of Selectmen the placement of cameras was informed by Blue Line Solutions

- At the April 10, 2025 Board of Selectmen meeting, Heavey sought approval for the speed camera plan and said that "camera placement was determined with help from Blue Line Solutions," a firm that conducted traffic studies and reviewed historical crash and enforcement data to pick the school zones with the most speeders.

2. Patch and other reporting also cite Heavey attributing location decisions to Blue Line's surveys

- In coverage of the same Selectmen hearing, Patch reported that surveys and traffic studies conducted by Blue Line Solutions identified the school zones with the highest number of speeders, and that the Board had granted approval to the police to move forward with the cameras based on that information.

3. Public Police Statements Reflect Blue Line's Role in Site Selection

- Later reporting on the implementation of the camera program reiterated the Chief's comments about why the cameras were placed where they are — noting that placement was guided by traffic studies and crash data with assistance from Blue Line Solutions.

Chief of Police James Heavey said this was being done because of Public Act 23-116 which allowed local police departments to use speed cameras. He noted Stamford had changed its ordinance just recently and felt there were "really good" vendors that had submitted bids. Heavey said a traffic study would be done in advance of any placement of the devices and the focus would be school zones. He said they would identify locations that would be most effective and there would be a period of change with signage going up to alert people and then enforcement. Part of the fee for violations would go to pay for the devices and also cover Town traffic and safety initiatives. Chief Heavey said they had gotten very little negative input about it and he felt it would be a positive thing.

Site #3- Traffic/ADT Data: Indian Rock Ln

Blue Line Solutions, LLC  
4409 Oakwood Dr., Chattanooga, TN 37416  
Tel: (855) 252-0086 Fax: (423) 803-1500  
www.bluelinesolutions.com

<b>Speed Limit</b>	<b>25 mph</b>
Average Speed	27 mph
50 <sup>th</sup> Percentile Speed	27 mph
85 <sup>th</sup> Percentile Speed	31 mph
Max Speed	75 mph

Safe

Site #5: Traffic/ADT Data: Riversville Rd

Blue Line Solutions, LLC  
4409 Oakwood Dr., Chattanooga, TN 37416  
Tel: (855) 252-0086 Fax: (423) 803-1500  
www.bluelinesolutions.com

<b>Speed Limit</b>	<b>35 mph</b>
Average Speed	35 mph
50 <sup>th</sup> Percentile Speed	36 mph
85 <sup>th</sup> Percentile Speed	41 mph
Max Speed	101 mph

Safe

Site #8 - Traffic/ADT Data: North Street

Blue Line Solutions, LLC  
4409 Oakwood Dr., Chattanooga, TN 37416  
Tel: (855) 252-0086 Fax: (423) 803-1500  
www.bluelinesolutions.com

<b>Speed Limit</b>	<b>35 mph</b>
Average Speed	36 mph
50 <sup>th</sup> Percentile Speed	37 mph
85 <sup>th</sup> Percentile Speed	42 mph
Max Speed	105 mph

Safe

Site #10- Traffic/ADT Data: E. Putnam Ave

Blue Line Solutions, LLC  
4409 Oakwood Dr., Chattanooga, TN 37416  
Tel: (855) 252-0086 Fax: (423) 803-1500  
www.bluelinesolutions.com

<b>Speed Limit</b>	<b>35 mph</b>
Average Speed	34 mph
50 <sup>th</sup> Percentile Speed	35 mph
85 <sup>th</sup> Percentile Speed	42 mph
Max Speed	103 mph

Safe

? How did these make the list? Not supported by the evidence

There was widespread compliance with posted speed limits before the cameras

There is not a systemic speeding problem shown in evidence submitted to OSTA...

[But if the data is accurate, please catch all the drivers at 100mph – it implies data errors]

And clearly Sites #1, #4, #6, #7 are justified

(9:00 AM - 2:30 PM)			(8:45 AM - 2:40 PM)		
Vehicle Count	Speeders	% Speeding	Vehicle Count	Speeders	% Speeding
1,997	50	2.5%	7,471	326	4.4%
2,115	52	2.5%	7,736	283	3.7%
2,001	52	2.6%	8,293	308	3.7%
1,953	46	2.4%	7,902	406	5.1%
2,278	68	3.0%	7,537	288	3.8%
<b>10,344</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>38,939</b>	<b>1,611</b>	<b>4.1%</b>

Safe

Safe





**National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices**

13236 North 7th Street, Suite 4-259, Phoenix, Arizona 85022  
Phone/Text: 231-4-NCUTCD (231-462-8823)  
E-mail: secretary@ncutcd.org Website: https://ncutcd.org

Item No.: 25A-RW-1

**NCUTCD RECOMMENDATION FOR CHANGES TO THE MANUAL ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES**

**COMMITTEE / TASK FORCE:** Regulatory and Warning Signs Technical Committee  
**ITEM NUMBER:** 25A-RW-01  
**TOPIC:** School Zone When Flashing for CAV  
**ORIGIN OF REQUEST:** CAV Joint Task Force and Signs for CAV MCTF  
**AFFECTED SECTIONS OF MUTCD:** 7B.05

**DEVELOPMENT HISTORY:**  
Approved by RWSTC: 01/08/2025, 06/11/2025  
Approved by CAVJTF: 01/08/2025  
Approved by NCUTCD Council: 06/12/2025

*This is a recommended change to the MUTCD that has been approved by the NCUTCD Council. This proposal does not represent a revision of the MUTCD and does not constitute official MUTCD standards, guidance, or options. It will be submitted to FHWA for consideration for inclusion in a future MUTCD revision. The MUTCD can be revised only through the federal rulemaking process.*

**SUMMARY:**  
The practice of utilizing hour, day and "when children present" text plaques to define the presence of a school speed limit for a School Speed Limit Assembly (Figure 7B-1) is inconsistent with 11th Edition MUTCD language in Part 5. To clarify intent, a new support statement is proposed for Part 7.

**DISCUSSION:**  
The 11th Edition of the MUTCD Section 1A.03 states that "traffic control devices can be targeted at operators of motor vehicles, including driving automation systems, and at vulnerable road users." The need for uniformity and consistency in sign applications are a key aspect for all road users (Section 1A.01) and for driving automation systems (Section 5A.04). In Part 7 the use of school speed limit assemblies offers at least four options to address the periods of the day that the speed limit applies. In 1971 when school speed limit signs first were introduced to the MUTCD, states had (and continue today) with various laws regarding school zone speed limits and required signing. This has resulted in various applications using the options afforded in the MUTCD.

The various plaques (S4-1P, 4-2P, S4-4P and S4-1P with S4-6P) all approach the definition of when the speed limit is in effect in different manners as shown in Figure 7B-1 (to right). For a human driver, driving automation systems (DAS), and enforcement understanding "when children are present" is difficult for example a person dressed in a hoodie and jeans could be an adult or child. The unwritten understanding of 7:30-8:30 AM during school days is a common understanding but drivers and DAS requires literal interpretation. Even MON-FRI (during summer or teacher service days) requires interpretation. Clearly defining every circumstance and school district operation (and schools with ball fields and parks) creates lack of clarity for both human drivers and DAS. Use of plaques of this nature can be inconsistent with stated objectives of the MUTCD 11th Edition (Section 1A.01 B. and C.) and Chapter 5 (Section 5A.04 P06A and 5B.01, P03A) where guidance calls for:

- Applying uniform and consistent traffic control devices on each type of roadway and applying a similar approach to traffic control at similar locations in similar situations
- Clearly associating the sign application with the displayed message road to which it applies with different speed limits or restrictions

**RECOMMENDED MUTCD CHANGES:**  
The following reflect the proposed changes to the current MUTCD within the context of the MUTCD language. Proposed additions to the MUTCD are shown in blue underline and proposed deletions from the MUTCD are shown in red strikethrough. Changes previously approved by NCUTCD Council (but not yet adopted by FHWA) are shown in green double underline for additions and green double underline with strikethrough for deletions. In some cases, background comments may be provided with the MUTCD text. These comments are indicated by bracketed white text in a shaded green.

**PART 7. TRAFFIC CONTROL FOR SCHOOL AREAS**  
**CHAPTER 7B. SIGNS**  
**Section 7B.05 School Speed Limit Signs and Plaques**  
**Standard:**  
A School Speed Limit Assembly (see Figure 7B-1) or a School Speed Limit (SS-1) sign (see Figure 7B-1) or a School Speed Limit Sign Assembly (see Figure 7B-1) shall indicate the speed limit where a reduced school speed limit zone has been established. If a reduced school speed limit zone has been established, a School (S1-1) sign in advance (see Table 2C-3 for advance placement guidelines) of the first School assembly S4-1 sign or School Speed Limit assembly that is encountered in each approach to the reduced school speed limit zone (see Figures 7B-2 and 7B-4).  
Except as provided in Paragraph 4 of this Section, the downstream end of a posted reduced school speed limit zone shall be identified with an END SCHOOL (SS-3) sign (see Figures 7B-1, 7B-2, and 7B-4).  
Option:  
If a reduced school speed limit zone ends at the same point as a designated school zone, an END SCHOOL ZONE (SS-2) sign may be used instead of an END SCHOOL (SS-3) sign. A standard Speed Limit sign showing the speed limit for the section of highway downstream from the authorized and posted reduced school speed limit zone may be placed at the same point above the END SCHOOL SPEED LIMIT (SS-3) sign or the END SCHOOL sign.  
Guidance:  
The beginning point of a reduced school speed limit zone should be at least 200 feet from the school grounds or a school crossing; however, this 200-foot distance should be reduced to 100 feet for school speed limits 30 mph or higher. The maximum beginning point of a reduced school speed limit zone should not be greater than 500 feet in advance of the school grounds or a school crossing.  
Standard:  
The School Speed Limit assembly shall be one of the following: either  
A. a static sign assembly with Speed Limit Sign Beacons;  
B. a blank-out sign, or  
C. a changeable message sign (see Chapter 2L), or  
D. a static sign assembly.  
(Revised to ordered list and added B.)

**25A-RW-01-School Zone When Flashing for CAV**

The school speed limit assembly signs are not uniform and consistent AT Greenwich High School or across Greenwich schools in general – Hillside approach signs have times listed, while the Putnam approach has when flashing.

The standard is "applying uniform and consistent traffic control devices at similar locations in similar situations"

10—The static School Speed Limit assembly shall consist of a top plaque (S4-3P) with the legend SCHOOL, a Speed Limit (R2-1) sign, and a bottom plaque (S4-1P, S4-2P, S4-4P, or S4-6P) indicating the specific periods of the day and/or days of the week that the special school speed limit is in effect (see Figure 7B-1). (Revised to ordered list and added D.)  
11—When a School Speed Limit When Flashing (SS-1) sign or a School Speed Limit assembly (R2-1) sign with a supplemental WHEN FLASHING (S4-4P) plaque is used, a Speed Limit Sign Beacon (see Section 4S.04) shall be used to identify the periods that the school speed limit is in effect.  
Support:  
12—School Speed Limit When Flashing (SS-1) sign, School Speed Limit assembly with WHEN FLASHING (S4-4) plaque, blank-out signs, or changeable message signs and Speed Limit Sign Beacons with WHEN FLASHING (S4-4) plaques support driving automation systems by provide clear, and simple meaning when the school speed limit is in effect for all drivers, driving automation systems (see Section 5B.01) and enforcement.  
13—Laws, regulations, and ordinances can inform school speed limit sign and plaque applications. (07a and 07b added to address massive clarity to road users, including automated vehicles.)  
Standard:  
14—If used, the static School Speed Limit assembly (see Figure 7B-1) shall consist of a top plaque (S4-3P) with the legend SCHOOL, a Speed Limit (R2-1) sign, and a bottom plaque (S4-1P, S4-2P, or S4-4P) with a S4-6P. The bottom plaque(s) shall indicate the conditions specifying when the school speed limit is in effect.  
15—Fluorescent yellow-green pixels shall be used when the "SCHOOL" message is displayed on a changeable message sign for a school speed limit.  
Option:  
16—Changeable message signs may use blank-out messages or other methods in order to display the school speed limit only during the periods it applies.  
17—A Vehicle Speed Feedback (W13-20aP) plaque that displays the speed of approaching drivers (see Sections 2B.2) and 2C.1), that is part of a School Speed Limit assembly or a School Speed Limit When Flashing (SS-1) sign, may be used in a school speed limit zone.  
Guidance:  
18—If used, the Vehicle Speed Feedback (W13-20aP) plaque should only be used during the time period when the school speed limit is in effect.  
19—A Reduced School Speed Limit Ahead (S4-See S4-Su) sign (see Figure 7B-1) should be used to inform road users of a reduced speed zone where the speed limit is being reduced by more than 10 mph, or where engineering judgment indicates that advance notice would be appropriate.  
Standard:  
20—If used, the Reduced School Speed Limit Ahead sign shall be followed by a School Speed Limit sign or a School Speed Limit assembly.  
21—The speed limit displayed on the Reduced School Speed Limit Ahead sign shall be identical to the speed limit displayed on the subsequent School Speed Limit sign or School Speed Limit assembly.

To add to the confusion, town website information and police department statements also apply an inappropriate "when children are present" standard

A successful CT DOT work zone pilot speed camera program should be emulated in school zones  
 Their approach, marketing, signs, data, etc. resulted in effective changes and improved safety without substantial fines to motorists – Signs, warnings and outreach worked without thousands of violations

## Key findings from the Pilot include:

**1** Drivers in a work zone on average drove slower when the Pilot was in effect compared to the period before the Pilot started. This finding was based on sizeable collection of data before and after system deployment. ~~Of the five locations analyzed, all showed reductions in driver speeds, with four locations showing significant reductions in speed when compared to data collected prior to enforcement. In particular, speeding reduced at two work zones on I-95 by 17 to 18 percent. This reduction can be attributed to the active speed enforcement, signage, and public outreach through the Know the Zone campaign. Speeding at other locations also reduced, but could have also been partially attributed to changes in work zone conditions that could not be controlled for in the data set.~~

**2** The Pilot achieved success in moderating the behavior of drivers speeding in work zones through the issuance of written Warnings and without substantial financial impact to motorists. During the Pilot, more than 24,900 Warnings were issued but fewer than 750 Notice of Violation with a fine were issued. The overall reduction of driver speed in tandem with the relatively low percentage of repeat offenders represents a strong indicator that automated speed control technology can be beneficial.

**3** Inclusion of public outreach within any future work zone safety program will be beneficial to educate the public and align public awareness with enforcement. The Pilot allowed CTDOT to conduct robust public outreach to educate drivers about the importance of work zone safety to drivers and workers, and the relationship between public safety and automated speed control technology. A *Know the Zone* branded public awareness campaign included a mix of highway billboards, targeted digital advertisements, media interviews, an ongoing social media presence, and other communications tools.



On a side note: The signs used were standard and uniform speed limit photo enforced signs



**17.4 million impressions**  
via digital billboard ads


**6.8 million impressions**  
via cable TV ads

**4.1 million impressions**  
via Facebook and Instagram ads

All metrics were at least **▲ 10% higher** than estimated

**21 million additional impressions**  
from news media story pitching and social media marketing activities

<https://portal.ct.gov/dot/-/media/dot/programs/know-the-zone/ctdot-know-the-zone-report-to-cga.pdf?rev=fbbbfce870940eeafc687ea820dcd73>



Who Performed Due Diligence on Blue Line?

Could Greenwich Face Potential Financial Liability?

Blue Line Has A Problematic Track / Legal Record

Even A cursory Review Is Troubling

We've Seen How This Movie Ends Before

Pattern of Misconduct With Private Companies

- Arizona Secretary of State, Jan Brewer, confirmed that Redflex documents used in court to convict motorists of speeding in Lafayette, Louisiana had been falsified.
- Many cities have all been caught shortening yellow lights to increase profits from red light cameras.
- In Italy, a speed camera company was caught in a fraud scandal that involved 109 officials and contractors.
- In January 2009, the makers of the T-Red brand of red light cameras were similarly arrested for fraud after prosecutors found motorists were being trapped at intersections with short yellows and improperly certified equipment
- Redflex violated federal law by using radar units that were not FCC certified.
- Redflex employees have been charged with assault, child pornography, and extreme DUI (while driving a photo radar van). They can observe your car, wife, and children and they can figure out where you live. They have access to your DMV records.

**Florida: Public Backlash Ends a School-Zone Program**

In early 2025, **Manatee County, Florida**, became the latest jurisdiction to pull the plug on automated enforcement. County commissioners voted 5-2 to end their **school-zone speed-camera program** after just months of operation. Local reports say more than **55,000 tickets** were issued in that short window.

Coverage from The Sun and Spectrum News 9 described widespread frustration: drivers claimed they were ticketed when flashers weren't active, during times when no students were present, on stretches where speed limits suddenly dropped.

Critics called the system a "money grab," noting that camera vendors received a portion of each fine. Supporters argued that school zone safety outweighed the inconvenience. But public sentiment quickly turned, and commissioners concluded that **the loss of trust outweighed any potential safety gain.**

Florida law still allows cameras in certain school zones, but counties must adopt them voluntarily—meaning local politics often determine their lifespan.

**Hawaii: A History of False Starts and Public Resistance**

Hawaii's relationship with automated speed enforcement has been one of the most turbulent in the nation. In the early 2000s, the state launched a photo-radar program nicknamed the "**van cam**", which was designed to deter speeding along Oahu's busiest highways.

However, the experiment quickly collapsed amid **massive public backlash**. Drivers complained about hidden vans, confusing signage, and tickets that arrived weeks after the alleged violation. The public viewed the system as an unfair "speed trap," and by 2002, lawmakers voted overwhelmingly to **shut it down** after only five months in operation.

Two decades later, in 2023, Hawaii tried again with a **red-light and speed-camera pilot program** in Honolulu. The new system focused on high-crash intersections rather than mobile vans, with the goal of improving transparency and accountability. While supporters praised early data showing fewer serious crashes, critics remain wary that the program could expand too far or reintroduce the same fairness issues as before.

As a result, Hawaii remains divided: the state technically allows cameras under limited pilot conditions, but **longstanding public distrust continues to limit their acceptance**. It's a vivid reminder that once a camera program loses public confidence, rebuilding it can take decades.

**Iowa shuts down most speed cameras**

**Iowa: When Safety Data Isn't Enough**

In September 2025, the **Iowa Department of Transportation rejected Des Moines' request** to reinstall several speed cameras, concluding that the city hadn't proven the devices made roads safer under new state standards (Axios Des Moines).

The DOT required evidence that cameras **reduce crashes** rather than simply issue tickets. Des Moines argued that the cameras deterred speeding on high-risk corridors, but the state cited insufficient crash-reduction data. Iowa's ruling limits where both fixed and mobile units can operate and gives municipalities **only narrow grounds to appeal**.

The case highlights a broader shift: state officials want **clear proof of safety benefits** before granting or renewing camera permits. Iowa isn't alone—transport agencies in several states now require yearly safety audits and public reporting before re-approval.


**TORONTO**

As of November 14, 2025, Automated Speed Enforcement (ASE) penalty orders will no longer be issued in accordance with provincial legislation. ASE penalty orders for violations that occurred before November 14, 2025 remain valid and must be **paid** by the due date or **disputed** by the deadline (30 days from the date of issuance).

10:55

## Blue Line Solutions agrees to settlement in Girard speed camera class action, DannLaw, Zimmerman Law Offices vow to continue fighting to hold city accountable for issuing bogus tickets

June 22, 2021 By Marc Dann



Blue Line Solutions, LLC, co-defendant with Girard, Ohio in a class-action lawsuit filed by DannLaw and Zimmerman Law Offices PC on behalf of 7,700 motorists wrongly cited for speeding while traveling through the city of Girard, Ohio on Interstate 80, has agreed to pay \$175,000 to settle the lawsuit. The settlement was made against the speed camera company Blue Line Solutions. Marc Dann, DannLaw founder and former Ohio Attorney General, says the settlement remains a victory for the class. "How can I help you?"

\$175,000 payment from Tennessee-based Blue Line Solutions will be distributed after all class members have been identified. The settlement automatically receives checks unless they choose to opt-out.

dannlaw.com

10:54

Safari

Caddo Mama Bears · Join  
Lisa Reese Massingill · Feb 10, 2025 ·

SB Focus SB / The Inquisitor News · Follow  
Feb 10, 2025 ·

### CADDO PARISH SHOULD HAVE MANY REQUIREMENTS IN CONTRACT WITH BLUE LINE SOLUTIONS

Caddo Parish will soon contract with Blue Line Solutions to enforce speed laws on parish roads. This effort will be coordinated with Caddo Sheriff Henry Whitehorn in the selection of the roads to be monitored. This will be a six month trial program.

Blue Line Solutions has the contract with the City of Shreveport to enforce speed limits at Caddo Parish schools in the city limits. This program encountered many challenges in its first months of operation.

Here are some of the problems encountered by residents and the City of Shreveport with Blue Line Solutions:

1. Signage and flashing lights were not timely installed by Blue Line--it is not known if the parish roads will have signage on Blue Line speed monitoring.
2. Citations issued by Blue Line identified the vehicle by its license plate and cited the vehicle owner without proof of who actually was driving the vehicle at the time of the speed violation.
3. Blue Line failed to open an office in

Write a public comment...

By paying the citation, he/she waived their right to contest as stated under the GA state statute.

10:44

in violation of O.C.G.A. § 40-14-18 for excessive speed in a school zone on March 7, 2023. More specifically, the citation states that a camera took photographs of Thomas Chastain's automobile traveling 58 miles per hour in a school zone with a speed limit of 20 miles per hour. A copy of the "Notice of Citation" is attached hereto as Exhibit "A".

7. The Chastains' "Notice of Citation" states a 2021 Jeep registered to Thomas Chastain was photographed violating the "School Zone Electronic Enforcement Statute" and, as the registered owner of the vehicle, Thomas Chastain was responsible for a Civil Monetary Penalty. The Civil Monetary Penalty set forth in the citation was \$100.

8. Blue Line did not send to Mr. and Mrs. Chastain "a copy of a certificate sworn to or affirmed by a certified peace officer" that complies with Georgia law. On information and belief, no officer was administered an oath by a person authorized to administer oaths verifying the violation asserted in the citation sent by Blue Line to Mr. Chastain. The statement to the contrary in the citation that Blue Line mailed to Mr. Chastain was materially false and deceptive, and was used to extract money from Mr. Chastain in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1341 and O.C.G.A. § 16-8-3.

9. Plaintiffs Thomas and Emma Chastain paid \$75 of the "\$100 Civil Monetary Penalty" solicited by Blue Line by check payable to "Town of Tallulah Falls" on or about April 28, 2023. A true and correct copy of the check indicating payment is attached hereto as Exhibit "B". The check, though payable to "Town of Tallulah Falls," was deposited by Blue Line in an account maintained by Blue Line in Chattanooga, Tennessee. The payment was not voluntary. All the facts were not known to the Chastains at the time of payment.

Case 2:23-cv-00160-RWS Document 1 Filed 08/17/23 Page 5 of 28

classaction.org

10:55

indeed Sign in Open app

Blue Line Solutions 1.3 ★

Follow Write a review

3 Reviews Salaries Jobs Q&A Interviews

### Working at Blue Line Solutions: 3 Reviews

Updated July 10, 2025

Overall rating 1.3 ★

Based on 3 reviews

Detailed ratings

Work-life balance	Pay and benefits	Job security and advancement
2.3 ★	2.3 ★	1.0 ★

What people are saying

- ✓ Time and location flexibility
- ✓ Feeling of personal appreciation

Sign in to Indeed with Google

Continue

indeed.com

"Blue Line website is challenging to navigate, and their customer service is horrendous, they don't respond to emails"

10:57

**Press Release • Ohio Auditor of State**

**State Audit Again Finds Inadequate Controls in Village of Brice's Photo Speed Enforcement Program**

For immediate release

Tuesday, March 1, 2022

**Contact:**  
Allie Dumski  
Press Secretary  
(614) 644-1111

Columbus – The Village of Brice in southeastern Franklin County again failed to implement adequate controls to ensure traffic citations issued and fines ultimately collected from automated speed enforcement cameras were in proper order, according to a formal review of financial statements released Tuesday by Auditor of State Keith Faber.

It was the third consecutive biennial audit of the village's finances that included the internal control finding related to the fines, which accounted for the majority of the village's general cash receipts.

Fines, licenses and permits totaled \$377,517 in 2020 and \$561,862 in 2019, 76% and 81% of general fund collections, which totaled nearly \$2.3 million from 2015-2020.

ohioauditor.gov

10:58

majority of the village's general cash receipts.

Fines, licenses and permits totaled \$377,517 in 2020 and \$561,862 in 2019, 76% and 81% of general fund receipts, respectively. Photo speed enforcement fees made up more than 99% of fine, license, and permit collections, which totaled nearly \$2.3 million from 2015-2020.

"This tiny village is a speed trap reliant on automated speeding citations to pay the bills. There's no other reason for it to exist," Auditor Faber said.

Brice continued the cameras' use in 2019 and '20, contracting with two outside firms to process citations, handle billing, and collect fines. Consistent with prior year reports, auditors noted, "... the village failed to maintain approval of tickets submitted to Brekford Corp. and Blue Line Solutions LLC for the photo speed enforcement program. As a result, we were unable to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence supporting the amounts recorded as camera speed enforcement fines. Consequently, we were unable to determine whether any adjustments to these amounts were necessary."

The use of speed enforcement cameras by Brice has been challenged in court by residents in separate lawsuits, alleging the village lacked authority to adjudicate noncriminal traffic law citations. Both cases, one filed in October 2020 and the other in January 2021, were dismissed as moot by the Ohio Supreme Court, after the village dismissed the actions against those who sued. A separate lawsuit on traffic enforcement cameras involving other municipalities is pending before the Ohio Supreme Court.

ohioauditor.gov

10:58

cases, one filed in October 2020 and the other in January 2021, were dismissed as moot by the Ohio Supreme Court, after the village dismissed the civil actions against those who sued. A separate lawsuit on traffic enforcement cameras involving other municipalities is pending before the Ohio Supreme Court.

According to court documents, Brice "suspended its use of the traffic law photo-monitoring device as of May 24, 2021."

In their response to the Auditor of State's latest findings, village officials added, "The camera program is currently suspended, but when/if the village is able to resume the camera program," increased reporting requirements will be included in contracts with the third-party administrators involved.

The full report will be available on the AOS website using [Audit Search](#).

###

*The Auditor of State's office, one of five independently elected statewide offices in Ohio is responsible for auditing more than 6,000 state and local government agencies. Under the direction of Auditor Keith Faber, the office also provides financial services to local governments, investigates and prevents fraud in public agencies, and promotes transparency in government.*

ohioauditor.gov

# 'Hook, line and sinker' | Georgia lawmaker regrets supporting speed camera law

State Rep. Dewey McClain said speed cameras were pitched to protect children. But Georgia pedestrian fatalities have increased.



'Cash cow' | Private industry enforcing GA laws on police' behalf

By Andy Pierrotti  
Published: Jun. 6, 2024 at 2:24 PM EDT |  
Updated: Jun. 7, 2024 at 8:41 AM EDT

"Taxation Through Citation," a series from ANF Investigates, won the News Special award at the 2025 Southeast Emmys. For more on the series, click here.

GIVE THE GIFT OF PREMIER GOLF atlantanewsfirst.com

By Andy Pierrotti  
Published: Jun. 6, 2024 at 2:24 PM EDT |  
Updated: Jun. 7, 2024 at 8:41 AM EDT

"Taxation Through Citation," a series from ANF Investigates, won the News Special award at the 2025 Southeast Emmys. For more on the series, click here.

SOUTH FULTON, Ga. (Atlanta News First) - Standing in his South Fulton kitchen, George Worrell opens a drawer so full of traffic citations, spilling some to the floor. He's received at least 40 over the past few years.

The citations were not issued by South Fulton's Police Department, but by a private company which enforces traffic laws on the agency's behalf. Blue Line Solutions operates the city's 16 school zone speed detection cameras. The citations it issues are mailed from the company's Tennessee headquarters to violators.

Worrell, a local pastor and father of two, confesses he's likely guilty of speeding for some, but not all. He said the company makes it difficult to dispute tickets.

"I love the idea for child safety of course, that's first and foremost, but I believe it is exploiting taxpaying citizens," Worrell said. The tickets are civil penalties, which do not impact drivers' licenses or insurance. If left unpaid, drivers can't renew their vehicle registrations.

GIVE THE GIFT OF PREMIER GOLF atlantanewsfirst.com

According to city records, South Fulton drivers paid at least \$21 million in camera fines, more than any Georgia municipality. The city's contract with Blue Line shows the company receives 35 percent from each ticket.

According to that math, the city collected \$14 million while the camera operator collected \$7 million. Atlanta News First Investigates asked Blue Line about our analysis, but it did not respond.

Public records show South Fulton used some of the camera money to buy tasers, uniforms, computers, vehicle repairs, and an armed vehicle, all of which cost \$359,000. State law mandates the revenue can only be used for public safety purposes.

ADVERTISEMENT Tools and resources to manage your retirement and live life your way. AAL LEARN MORE

South Fulton Police Chief Keith Meadows advocated for the cameras after he said several residents complained about speeding in school zones. He pointed to a traffic study showing since the cameras were installed in 2019, the number of speeding vehicles in school zones dropped more than 90 percent.

South Fulton Revenue from Speed Can GIVE THE GIFT OF PREMIER GOLF atlantanewsfirst.com

Initial Complaint Date: 04/30/2025 Type: Billing Issues Status: Answered

Blue line solutions is a scam. I received a ticket for going 44mph well after 4:30pm in a school zone. I thought the speed limit was 45mph after 4:30pm and there wasn't even a child in sight. They also charged me one hundred dollars for my first offense ever.

Business Response Date: 05/02/2025

Blue Line Solutions, LLC (BLS) is a service provider for government agencies who wish to deploy automated speed enforcement technology to enforce speed limits in school zones. BLS has a contract with the city of South Fulton, GA in which BLS provides automated LIDAR (laser) speed measuring devices

# Flash Digest – News in Brief

By Zach Buchanan – Edited by Henry Li  
February 12, 2018

REPORTS FLASH DIGEST NATIONAL SECURITY

## Court Orders Town to Reimburse \$3 Million in Unconstitutional Speed Camera Tickets

The Ohio Court of Appeals ordered the town of New Miami, Ohio to pay back over \$3 million in speed camera tickets, affirming a lower court decision from 2017, and ending a six-year legal battle over the town's speed camera usage. New Miami is a tiny town – less than a single square mile – but it will now be sending out \$3,066,523 in refunds to various drivers who passed through the town on US 127, a major highway. New Miami has been using speed cameras to have the local police issue speeding tickets by mailing the tickets directly to drivers, without any involvement from the criminal justice system or from insurance companies.

The court noted that because recipients of these tickets were unable to challenge their tickets, New Miami's methods resulted in a "denial of due process." Additionally, the court was wary of New Miami's relationship to the speed camera provider, Blue Line Solutions. Blue Line gave New Miami the traffic cameras for free, in return for New Miami agreeing both to run the cameras for at least 100 hours a month and to split the fines from the camera tickets with the company. The relationship naturally encouraged New Miami to become a speed trap where police could issue easy tickets to score both the town and the camera company money.

New Miami tried claiming a sovereign immunity defense by arguing that it cannot be liable for monetary damages in a civil suit, but the Appeals Court was not swayed, noting that this lawsuit was seeking refunds and not ordinary monetary damages. The Appeals Court quoted the Ohio Supreme Court that "a suit that seeks the return of specific funds wrongfully collected...is not barred by sovereign immunity." This \$3 million payback fine will fall now entirely on New Miami; Blue Line Solutions is not liable if the town deployed the cameras unlawfully. Despite the blow, the court assured New Miami that it "has the authority to enforce its traffic laws...in a constitutional manner."

## ICE Gets Access to a Nationwide License Plate Database

The Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agency got its own holiday gift this year, finalizing a contract in late December that will grant them query-based access to a nationwide license plate database. The agency made this push back in light of the government's recent

Miami has been using speed cameras to have the local police issue speeding tickets by mailing the tickets directly to drivers, without any involvement from the criminal justice system or from insurance companies.

The court noted that because recipients of these tickets were unable to challenge their tickets, New Miami's methods resulted in a "denial of due process." Additionally, the court was wary of New Miami's relationship to the speed camera provider, Blue Line Solutions. Blue Line gave New Miami the traffic cameras for free, in return for New Miami agreeing both to run the cameras for at least 100 hours a month and to split the fines from the camera tickets with the company. The relationship naturally encouraged New Miami to become a speed trap where police could issue easy tickets to score both the town and the camera company money.

New Miami tried claiming a sovereign immunity defense by arguing that it cannot be liable for monetary damages in a civil suit, but the Appeals Court was not swayed, noting that this lawsuit was seeking refunds and not ordinary monetary damages. The Appeals Court quoted the Ohio Supreme Court that "a suit that seeks the return of specific funds wrongfully collected...is not barred by sovereign immunity." This \$3 million payback fine will fall now entirely on New Miami; Blue Line Solutions is not liable if the town deployed the cameras unlawfully. Despite the blow, the court assured New Miami that it "has the authority to enforce its traffic laws...in a constitutional manner."

## ICE Gets Access to a Nationwide License Plate Database

The Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agency got its own holiday gift this year, finalizing a contract in late December that will grant them query-based access to a nationwide license plate database. The agency made this push back in light of the government's recent

## 'Follow the money' | Speed camera companies spending big on Georgia lawmakers

Legislature is weighing a ban on school zone cameras following Atlanta News First investigation.



Legislation under consideration in the Georgia General Assembly would ban school-zone speed detection cameras

By Andy Pierrotti  
Published: Mar. 5, 2025 at 4:40 PM EST | Updated: Mar. 5, 2025 at 7:51 PM EST

ATLANTA, Ga. (Atlanta News First) - Legislation under consideration in the Georgia General Assembly would ban school-zone speed detection cameras, and has sparked a fierce debate between lawmakers, law enforcement, and lobbyists.

Protect your rights with expert lawyers. Free case review near you. atlantanevfirst.com

ATLANTA, Ga. (Atlanta News First) - Legislation under consideration in the Georgia General Assembly would ban school-zone speed detection cameras, and has sparked a fierce debate between lawmakers, law enforcement, and lobbyists.

While some officials argue the cameras are necessary for public safety, critics contend they serve as revenue generators, and in some cases, ticketing drivers without sufficient warning.

According to public records, more than \$112 million in revenue from 2019 to May 2024. Ticketing cities and the camera operator per ticket.

According to some contractors, roughly 25 percent from the Georgia Department of Revenue in September, that happened to 133,000 people.

Taxation Through Cit Atlanta News First investigation A series of Atlanta News First investigations uncovered a loophole in Georgia law allowing cities to use police departments to budgets through fines forfeitures. A civil liberties organization says Georgia's worst state law enabling the practice.

The tickets are civil penalties; they don't impact drivers' licenses, but if left unpaid, drivers can't renew their Georgia vehicle registrations. According to the Georgia Department of Revenue in September, that happened to 133,000 people.

State Rep. Dale Washburn (R-Macon), who is sponsoring the bill to ban the cameras, criticized the current system. "It is clear this system is abusive," Washburn said, adding the cameras have generated more than \$200 million.

Advocates for the speed cameras argue they save lives. Decatur, Georgia, Police Chief Scott Richards told lawmakers speeding violations in his jurisdiction have dropped by 92 percent since implementing its camera system.

Bob Dallas, a former director of the Governor's Office of Highway Safety and now a consultant for Blue Line Solutions, lobbied for the cameras in 2018, arguing they would improve pedestrian safety. Blue Line Solutions has donated \$131,000 to lawmakers.







SHREVEPORT, La. (KTAL/KMSS) – As the City of Shreveport prepares to [fund public safety](#) using revenue from school zone camera citations many residents are wondering if the issues from the program's launch have been worked out.

As the 2022-2023 school year came to a close many Shreveport residents took to city council meetings to [express frustration](#) about what they claimed were improperly posted activation times and lack of consistency in time that speeding cameras are active.

Shreveport Mayor Tom Arceneaux said [Blue Line has corrected the cameras](#) and added more warning signs to notify drivers when school zone speed limits are being enforced.



"I think we finally worked out what the school zone hours are going to be so they are reasonably uninformed. People will know what to expect. There are going to be the signs – the signs should be there well posted, in addition, Blue Line has printed up warning signs that will be out," says Mayor Arceneaux.

The enforcement times:

- Elementary schools – 6:30 AM-8:30 AM and 2:00 PM-4:00 PM
- Middle schools – 7:00 AM-9:00 AM and 2:30 PM-4:30 PM
- High schools – 7:30 AM-9:30 AM and 2:30 PM-4:30 PM.

Mayor Arceneaux says they expect roughly two million dollars in revenue from traffic violations.



## SHREVEPORT'S PHOTO SPEED TICKETS ARE ILLEGAL AND COMPANY PAYS CLASS ACTION SUIT

Many citizens have complained about the speeding violations issued by Blue Line Solutions on behalf of the Shreveport Police Department. These are the photo violation tickets.

There are many problems with these tickets:

1. State law requires that the signs have a white background. The local speed signs are reflective yellow, and thus do not comply with state law.
  2. State law provides that not tickets may be issued without proper signage. Reportedly many tickets are issued in unposted school zones.
  3. State law requires signs to be within 250 feet to 500 feet of the enforcement area. Many of the posted signs do not comply with this requirement.
  4. City ordinance limits speeding tickets to a maximum fine of \$150. Some tickets being issued have a fine higher than that amount.
  5. To appeal the issue of the photo speed tickets a \$50 charge is imposed. This fee is not authorized by state law or local ordinance.
  6. State law states that any violation of the state requirements voids the tickets.
- Blue Line was sued in Ohio for tickets issued in a speed zone for traffic speeds that were UNDER the maximum speed limit.

In this suit, Blue Line agree to pay \$175,000 to settle claims in a class action suit.

Reportedly one or more local attorneys are interested in filing a class action locally for the issues identified in the column below.

The use of the photo speed camera raises a valid public policy issue: privatizing aspects of public service like law enforcement creates many dangers to the public.

The reality is that Blue Line is not accountable to voters or taxpayers. They make money from the tickets issued and share the proceeds with the city.

Shreveport Mayor Adrian Perkins and/or the city council should immediately suspend the Blue Line ticketing until there is a public review of the laws concerning this operation and the non-compliance with the same by Blue Line and the city of Shreveport.

POLITICS • ROAD SAFETY

# Georgia has made \$112 million from speed cameras in school zones, but over 100 lawmakers want to pull the plug: 'These camera companies are engaged in deceit and trickery'

By Jeff Amy and The Associated Press...  

March 4, 2025, 12:19 PM ET



Traffic passes an automated speed camera outside Beacon Hill Middle School in Decatur, Ga., on Tuesday, Feb. 25, 2025. JEFF AMY—AP PHOTO

fortune.com

One issue with abolishing cameras is that companies have become big political donors. Two big vendors, United Kingdom-based RedSpeed and Tennessee-based Blue Line Solutions, contributed around \$500,000 to Georgia campaigns in recent years, according to data compiled by OpenSecrets, a nonpartisan watchdog that tracks money in politics.

## Others want to reform camera use, not end it




Legislative leaders seem more likely to support two other bills that would keep cameras, but more closely regulate them by providing better warning signs and limiting the hours of usage.

"So the objective is to alert drivers that they're entering a school zone and get them to slow down and then for them not to be cited unless they are speeding in a school zone during designated hours," said Republican Sen. Max Burns of Sylvania, who is sponsoring [Senate Bill 75](#).



How a former Tesla and Lyft executive is trying to reinvent venture capital

fortune.com

[the city of Girard](#) and its use of traffic cameras to other drivers 11:07   

According to court documents, Judge Logan is allowing all drivers who received a speeding ticket in the mail via the City of Girard and Blue Line Solutions traffic cameras, during a specified period of time and location, to join a lawsuit claiming the tickets are not valid.

ADVERTISEMENT

The City of Girard previously filed a motion to dismiss the class-action status in order to "conserve judicial resources and to avoid potentially unnecessary expenditures of time and resources."

In order to obtain class-action status, cases must have a large identifiable group of plaintiffs of which it would be impractical to litigate each case independently. Also, each plaintiff must be easily identified, which the court found is possible through citation records from the City of Girard.

According to court documents, Girard issued 7,733 citations during the time period of December 7, 2017 to

wkbn.com

Blue Line Solutions has faced several problems, including:

- **Signage and Lighting Issues:** Timely installation of speed monitoring signage and flashing lights has been a challenge. [1](#)
  - **Citation Accuracy:** Citations have been issued without proof of who was driving at the time of the violation, leading to confusion and dissatisfaction. [1](#)
  - **Contractual Obligations:** The company has failed to fulfill its obligations under the contract with the City of Shreveport, including not opening an office as required. [1](#)
  - **Communication Delays:** The toll-free number on citations was often unresponsive, and voice messages were rarely returned. [1](#)
  - **Payment Issues:** There have been delays in remitting fines collected by citizens, which has frustrated many users. [1](#)
- These issues have raised concerns among residents and the City of Shreveport regarding the reliability of Blue Line Solutions' services.

*"The best way to get a bad law repealed is to enforce it strictly."*  
 Abraham Lincoln

# Subsequent Events – Post Publication Update

*Update Post Original Publishing:*

*Detailed hours of enforcement finally released by Chief Heavey on February 24, 2026 via Greenwich Free Press*

*This is a mess – A variety of different speed zone times and different speeds are enforced which varies from school to school – Makes it nearly impossible to memorize or abide with, particularly for non-residents. It’s almost designed for compliance to be challenging.*

*This makes accurate signage crucial – Which unfortunately is neither standard, uniform, compliant nor conspicuous.*

#### **Hours the ordinance is being enforced.**

- Central Middle School – The camera at Indian Rock Lane enforces a 20 mph speed limit from 7:30 to 8:30 a.m. and 2:15 to 4:15 p.m. The speed limit is at 25 mph from 8:31 a.m. to 4:14 p.m. The camera at Orchard Street will enforce a 20 mph limit from 7:30 to 8:30 and 2:15 to 4:15 and then 25 mph during the rest of the school day.
- Glenville School – The camera at Riversville Road enforces a 25 mph speed limit from 8:15 to 9:15 a.m. and 3:15 to 4:15 p.m. The speed limit is 35 mph from 9:16 a.m. to 3:14 p.m.
- Parkway School – The camera at Lower Cross Road enforces a 20 mph speed limit from 8:15 to 9:15 a.m. and 3:15 to 4:15 p.m. The speed limit is 30 mph from 9:16 a.m. to 3:14 p.m.
- North Street School – The camera at North Streer enforces a 25 mph speed limit from 8:15 to 9:15 a.m. and 3:15 to 4:15 p.m. The speed limit is 35 mph from 9:16 a.m. to 3:14 p.m.
- Brunswick Lower School – From Monday through Thursday, the camera at King Street enforces a 25 mph speed limit from 7:15 to 8:15 a.m. and 2:45 to 4 p.m. The speed limit is 35 mph from 8:46 a.m. to 2:44 p.m. This changes on Fridays, as there is a 25 mph speed limit from 7:15 to 8:45 a.m. and noon to 3:15 p.m. There is a 35 mph speed limit between 8:46 a.m. and 11:59 a.m.
- Eagle Hill School – The camera at Glenville Road enforces a 20 mph speed limit from 7:30 a.m. to 8:30 a.m. and 2:45 to 3:45 p.m. The speed limit is 30 mph from 8:31 a.m. to 2:44 p.m.
- Greenwich Academy – On Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday, the camera at North Maple Avenue enforces a 20 mph speed limit from 7:15 to 8:15 a.m. and 2 to 4:15 p.m. The speed limit is 30 mph from 8:16 a.m. to 1:59 p.m. This changes on Wednesday, as there is a 20 mph speed limit from 7:15 to 9:15 a.m. and 2 to 4:15 p.m. and 30 mph from 9:16 a.m. to 1:59 p.m.
- Greenwich High School – The cameras at Hillside Road and on East Putnam Avenue enforce a 25 mph speed limit from 7 to 8:15 a.m. and 2 to 4 p.m. The speed limit is at 30 mph from 8:16 a.m. to 1:59 p.m.

Did anyone from Greenwich read the legislation before signing a contract with Blue Line Solutions that is illegal?

**Blatant disregard for CGS 14-307c** as there is a direct incentive to issue more tickets

**If Blue Line Solutions is unwilling or unable to follow the law** and meet all requirements of the legislation, then **they should be fired for cause**. The sheer number of times they have blatantly disregarded warnings, disobeyed instructions and guidance and violated CT CGS in signing and implementing an illegal contract shows a complete disregard for following the rules.

## Cannot

In Connecticut, towns cannot pay speeding camera vendors based on the number of tickets they write. According to Connecticut law, any fees for automated traffic enforcement devices must not be contingent on the number of citations issued or fines paid. This means that municipalities can enter into agreements with vendors for the design and operation of speed cameras, but the fees for these services cannot be linked to the number of tickets issued. [crocogct.gov](https://crocogct.gov) +3

Asked about the share of the violations that goes to the vendor and how much to the police, Beattie said Blue Line Solutions is getting \$17.50 for a \$50 ticket (35%) and police get the remaining 65%.

Asked how will police department use their portion of the fines, Beattie explained, "We haven't actually gotten any proceeds to date. The revenue generated is still being applied towards the implementation of the program and installation of the cameras."

(b) The municipality may enter into agreements with vendors for the design, installation, operation or maintenance, or any combination thereof, of automated traffic enforcement safety devices. If a vendor designs, installs, operates or maintains an automated traffic enforcement safety device, the vendor's fee may not be contingent on the number of citations issued or fines paid pursuant to an ordinance adopted under this section.

In Middletown, citations began going out July 9th and more than 39,000 citations have been issued. \$1.4 million has been paid, with approximately \$750,000 going directly to Middletown after paying vendors, says Chief Costa.

*This "revenue sharing behavior" is absolutely a "money grab" from the vendors – Which is exactly why the CT legislature forbid contingent programs like those established in Greenwich and Middletown  
It certainly breaks the "spirit" of the law even if a loophole reimburses for expense-like costs. Semantic workaround?*

<https://law.justia.com/codes/connecticut/title-14/chapter-249/section-14-307c/>

<https://www.wfsb.com/2025/11/04/i-team-are-ct-speed-cameras-about-public-safety-or-money-i-team-takes-concerns-local-towns/>

Hearings Wed 2/25/2026 12:15 PM

To reiterate, we were never sent the citation by first class mail as required by statute. The notice of violation was addressed and sent to the wrong address (refer to the ticket and my previous emails). It was not sent to the registered owners address nor was it sent to our address on file with the tax collector, it was sent to a different address that does not match the owners.

We contested the ticket promptly when we received it (when our neighbor from down the street put it in our mailbox).

Furthermore, the postmark mailing date was FIVE (5) days later than the "issue date" on the ticket (and 21 days after the alleged violation date) and it didn't arrive until February 9<sup>th</sup> (a further five days later).

We responded within four business days of when it arrived to us.

Again – We have proof that Blue Line is not mailing violation letters to the correct address and back-dating the issue dates (that do not match the postmark date).

It is impossible to meet a 10-day deadline when issue dates are back-dated and tickets don't arrive until after the 10-day deadline.

We can go up the food chain if you want us to – The ball is in your court.

From: Hearings <hearings@violationpayment.net>

Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2026 11:55 AM

Subject: Re: Affidavits and Hearing Requests

Good morning,  
The citation ending in 2EP has been paused awaiting a court date. The other citation was denied due to being passed the contesting period.

If you have questions, please call 855.252.0086. If you wish to pay your citation, visit [www.violationpayment.net](http://www.violationpayment.net).

Thank you,

Hearings Processing Department

From: [Redacted]

Sent: Friday, February 20, 2026 10:58 AM

To: Hearings <hearings@violationpayment.net>

Subject: RE: Affidavits and Hearing Requests

You don't often get email from [Redacted]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Take Caution when opening links and attachments from this email, it did not come from a Blue Line employee

You asked for 48-72 hours - It's now Friday – Can you confirm that you have processed both requests?

Thank you,

[Redacted]

(1124) OSILGP OPEN SPEED ENFORCEMENT

Next Due Date: MAR 01, 2026

License Plate: [Redacted]

(1124) 2CA2EP PAUSED SPEED ENFORCEMENT

Next Due Date: MAR 11, 2026

License Plate: [Redacted]

## Blue Line Back-Dates Ticket "Issue Dates" And Then Refuses To Allow Hearings

From: Hearings <hearings@violationpayment.net>

Sent: Monday, February 16, 2026 3:09 PM

To: [Redacted]

Subject: Automatic reply: Affidavits and Hearing Requests

Hello,

Thank you for your email. This is an automated response to confirm that we have received your message. Please allow a minimum of 48-72 hours to process your request.

After which, please feel free to contact us at 855-252-0086 if you have any questions or concerns about your citation.

Best regards,  
Hearings Processing Department

Affidavits and Hearing Requests

[Redacted] <[Redacted]@transfers@violationpayment.net>; [Redacted] <hearings@violationpayment.net>

Affidavit and Hearing Requests.pdf 950 KB Disposition Receipt.jpg 300 KB

Your office is closed for the holiday – I tried calling 855-252-0086. Notary publics are also closed today, if you still need these attachments notarized after reading the explanation below, I can provide it when they are open, just let me know.

In the spirit of responding as quickly as possible (the same weekend we have received the notices of violation) I am sending these via email as requested and instructed on the notices and your website.

First and foremost – The street address you sent the notice to is not my address nor the registered owners address (I live at [Redacted]) – Please correct that for any future correspondence.

Secondly – I was not driving the vehicle and have multiple sources and witnesses to verify that I was 30+ minutes away from the location at the times of the incidents. I have ring camera footage, website logs, phone records, witness statements, etc. which can be provided if needed (one example for the exact same time is shown below).

Thirdly – The vehicle was sold prior to the issue date of the alleged violation. We have a plate disposition receipt with Receipt T-00 [Redacted] from the state of Connecticut.

Fourthly – The timestamps on the alleged violations were well before the operating/enforcement period as stated on the school zone signs and as given to us by the Greenwich police department and in the official OSTA submission plans and guidance and in public testimony/notice. This has happened at least three times (tickets and warnings being sent out well outside the times of enforcement) and blinking lights that are regularly not functioning properly (i.e. either running 24 hours a day or not blinking at all) and thus cannot be relied on by drivers. Furthermore, there were no children present at any of the times issued and it was not during school hours as required by the ordinance.

Fifthly – Presence is requested and required at the hearing for the issuing official given they are the same person that told us the official enforcement time periods that do not correspond to the times these violations were issued.

There are other issues to present if we need to appear in person – Including that there is not proper conspicuous notice as required from all approaches.

If you have any questions or need anything from me, please reach out.

Thank you,

[Redacted]

We appeal immediately and Blue Line waits 10 days to respond and then claims we missed a deadline?

Can a vendor's fee for the installation, operation, or maintenance of an Automated Traffic Enforcement Safety Device be contingent on the number of citations issued or fines paid?

No. The vendor's fees shall not be based on number of citations or fines paid.

When Connecticut passed legislation in 2023 allowing municipalities to use speed and red-light cameras (Public Act No. 23-116), they specifically prohibited paying vendors on a contingency basis—meaning the vendor's payment cannot be based on the number of tickets issued or the amount of fines collected.

- **Fixed Fees Over "Bounty" Systems:** Vendors must be paid through flat fees or fixed contracts for the installation, operation, and maintenance of the cameras, rather than receiving a "cut" or commission for every ticket generated.
- **Preventing "Ticket Traps":** This rule is designed to prevent vendors from prioritizing revenue generation over public safety. If vendors were paid per ticket, they might be incentivized to calibrate cameras

In 2023, Connecticut passed Public Act 23-116, which explicitly states that a vendor's fee "may not be contingent on the number of citations issued or fines paid".

**Photo radar companies got the majority of ticket revenue in some Colorado towns - A Steve On Your Side investigation found photo radar vendors taking more than half of the revenue from tickets, despite a law that discourages that.**

Author: Steve Staeger, Anna Hewson - Published: 9:28 PM MST February 19, 2026 - Updated: 9:28 PM MST **February 19, 2026**

KERSEY, Colo — It's a sales pitch that's played out in small city and town council chambers across Colorado: photo radar systems are a win-win — slowing traffic down while allowing local governments to collect much-needed revenue. But what often isn't discussed in those meetings is the profit the businesses pitching those systems stand to make. **State law bans towns and cities from paying their vendors based on the number of tickets issued.** A Steve On Your Side investigation found some photo radar vendors have created pricing structures to comply with that law, but still profit as towns write more photo radar tickets. In some cases, vendors running the systems capture more of the enforcement program than the town or city where the camera is located. In the small Weld County town of Kersey, which made headlines over a controversial decision to charge drivers more than their own ordinance for photo radar allowed, the vendor for services has captured nearly two-thirds of the revenue generated. Jefferson County city only pocketed 15% of its ticket revenue, with the rest going to that town's vendor.

Our findings have captured the attention of **state legislators who are already exploring the state's photo radar law to determine whether the guardrails created to prevent the cameras from becoming revenue generators are working.** An hourly rate based on the number of citations issued

Last summer, the Walsenburg city council heard a presentation from Russel Sarpy, the owner of a company called Emergent Enforcement Solutions (EES), offering his company's services for a photo radar system. "I like to say I'm not here to sell you anything," he said to the council during the July meeting. "My services are at no cost to your municipality." Sarpy explained his company offers municipalities a handheld photo radar gun officers can use during traffic enforcement, enabling them to capture speeding infractions that are sent to a cloud — meaning the officer doesn't have to offer the equipment free of charge, instead charging an hourly fee for ticket processing. Towns and cities can then pay the company for an equipment upgrade to a pole camera or a camera mounted trailer. "By law, we do not charge a rate based on citations issued," Sarpy told the council. "But we have an hourly rate for services rendered, which equates to basically the same thing." In the presentation, Sarpy explained his company charges **\$280 an hour to process citations.** He told councilors his company processes 20 tickets per hour, which he pointed out equals a rate of \$14 per \$40 photo radar ticket. "A proprietary way that we give you a discount is ensuring that you're never paying more than \$14 per citation issued," he told the council in a follow-up meeting. The Walsenburg council approved and the city entered into a contract with EES on July 15, but as of late last year, the city hadn't started using the camera yet and hadn't paid the company. Kersey, east of Greeley in Weld County, entered into an agreement with EES last April at the same \$280 per hour processing rate. For several months, the town used the free handheld radar gun along Weld County Road 49, then up September.

Data from Steve On Your Side found **the number of daily tickets issued dramatically increased once the trailer went live.** For the first 30 days, the daily average of tickets issued was around 1,200. In the month of October alone an EES invoice for the month of October billed the town \$359,170 for 1,282 hours of work. For context, there are only 744 hours in the entire month of October.

Records show the Town of Kersey brought in more than \$1.5 million in photo radar revenue between May and December of 2025. Though, in January, **the town voted to refund more than \$500,000** in \$340 tickets paid by some drive questioned whether the tickets were allowed by the town's ordinance capping fines at \$40.

After that anticipated refund, the town would be left with \$999,906 in revenue for the year, an analysis of financial records shows. Invoices from EES show the town paid its vendor \$664,656, nearly two thirds of that total revenue. Sarpy hasn't yet responded to emails, a text message or a voicemail from Steve On Your Side. But during a December presentation to the Lochbuie Board of Trustees, Sarpy said the hours invoiced don't tell the total sum of the work. "We have way more hours in the system than those hours that it took to just mail the citation out," he told trustees. "When citations come in from the gun or a camera that's a trailer or a fixed pole, it comes into our system, we have submissions view that looks at it and determines how many vehicles are present in the video or in the images, and what are the license plate numbers are, and are they legible and readable."

"We have hours expenditures on that that you're really not being charged for." Lochbuie's mayor told Steve On Your Side the town has delayed a decision on whether or not to implement photo radar to see if any changes are made to the law at the state Capitol this session.

EES charges the same hourly rate south on County Road 49 in Hudson, where Steve On Your Side found the town made \$746,440 in ticket revenue during the first year of its photo radar program, paying EES \$387,515, or 51% of its revenue. But not all vendors use the same hourly rate formula. In Wheat Ridge, which contracts with a company call Altumint, **the city is charged \$15 each time the company looks up a vehicle registration, an arrangement a police spokesman classified as a "revenue-sharing" agreement with the company.**

Alex Rose, Wheat Ridge Police spokesman, clarified the \$15 fee helps pay for the operating cost for the cameras and the vendor's processing costs to send out the citations. He also noted that while the company invoiced Wheat Ridge for registrations, the company only mailed 11,166 citations last year due to a multitude of problems with bad addresses and other issues with tickets.

In total, Wheat Ridge made \$499,586 in revenue from the photo enforcement program, but only kept \$75,811 of it, about 15%. Rose said the remainder was paid to the company to process citations during the state-mandated warning period for each camera, the city did not make revenue from any citations and had to pay the cost of warning citations mailed to drivers.

Wheat Ridge is currently seeking a change in state law to allow photo radar on interstate highways out of a desire to place the cameras along a portion of I-70.

RELATED: Colorado bill would allow cities to post speed cameras on interstates The town of Mountain View contracts with a company called Dacra. In the 2025 fiscal year, the first of the photo radar program, the town made a total of \$274,645 in ticket revenue, spend \$5.50 to process, verify and mail each citation. The company also charges \$5 for warning citations. And the company charges \$6 for managing adjudication cases should a driver "It feels icky"

Republican State Sen. Byron Pelton helped write some of the language of the state law governing these cameras. "I didn't want local governments using this as revenue-enhancing," he said. Pelton said he was originally opposed to the bill, but recommended changes to the late Democratic State Sen. Faith Winter, who sponsored it. "I worked on lots of language to make sure we had guardrails, that these were not abused, that if they were supposed to be used as safety tools, that's what they're being used as and not revenue-enhancing cameras."

**One of those guardrails — a portion of the law that says compensation to vendors may only be based on the value of services they issue — and may not be based on the number of citations issued.**

"If you're paying for your time and your effort and that sort of thing and your equipment, that's fine, but we don't want you to make a killing on these," he said. Hearing about towns sending more than half of their revenue to vendors and some vendors charging upwards of a third of the cost to process each \$40 ticket didn't sit well with him.

"It feels icky, actually, because that's not what we were meant to do," he said. "And again, I really had a hard time with this, because I don't like putting up speed cameras."

Pelton said he's already working on legislation to make changes to the 2023 law that allows municipalities to turn these cameras on — including strengthening language on warning periods after Steve On Your Side found some municipal warnings to drivers caught speeding during the state-mandated warning period.

He said some of the focus will also be on **strengthening rules to ensure businesses don't use tickets as a profit boost.**

"That's the loophole that we're going to have to figure out how we close moving forward with this bill, or with this, with this law, we're going to have to figure something out to fix that aspect of it," Pelton said.

Steve Staeger is the consumer investigator for 9NEWS. Anna Hewson is the consumer investigative producer. Contact Steve On Your Side with tips about this story or any other consumer problem.