



**TOWN COUNCIL
WATERTOWN, CONNECTICUT**

**TUESDAY, AUGUST 12, 2025
DIRECTLY FOLLOWING THE PUBLIC HEARING
WHICH IS SCHEDULED TO BEGIN AT 7:00 P.M.**

**SPECIAL MEETING
MINUTES**

**WATERTOWN TOWN HALL
TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS
61 ECHO LAKE RD.
WATERTOWN, CT 06795**

1. Call Meeting to Order.
Chair Mary Ann Rosa called the meeting to order at 8:35 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance.
Chair Mary Ann Rosa led the pledge of allegiance.

3. Roll Call.
PRESENT: Mary Ann Rosa, Chair
Ken Demirs, Vice Chair
Robert Desena
Anthony DiBona
Gary Lafferty
Carina Noyd
Robert Retallick
Rachael Ryan (phone)

ABSENT: Jonathan Ramsay

OTHERS PRESENT: Mark Raimo, Town Manager

4. Consider a resolution regarding the adoption of the proposed bond ordinance entitled:

AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING \$34,000,000 FOR SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION AGAINST THE TOWN IN THE CITY OF WATERBURY V. TOWN OF WATERTOWN AND FOR RELATED COSTS; AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUE OF BONDS OR NOTES AND TEMPORARY NOTES IN THE SAME AMOUNT TO FINANCE THE APPROPRIATION

Motion: Ken Demirs seconded by Robert Retallick: I make a motion that the Watertown Town Council approve the resolution adopting the bond ordinance titled:

AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING \$34,000,000 FOR SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION AGAINST THE TOWN IN THE CITY OF WATERBURY V. TOWN OF WATERTOWN AND FOR RELATED COSTS; AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUE OF BONDS OR NOTES AND TEMPORARY NOTES IN THE SAME AMOUNT TO FINANCE THE APPROPRIATION

Anthony DiBona asked just a clarifying question the way this reads, it is settlement of litigation but there is still a pending appeal to the Connecticut Supreme Court is that correct?

Mark Raimo answered that is correct.

Anthony Dibona asked this is to pay the bonds to pay the city this is not in full settlement to the city we never came to an agreement with the city, as to settling this appeal to the Connecticut Supreme Court, is that correct?

Mark Raimo answered that is correct.

Robert Desena stated for the sake of clarification I believe it should read proposed bond ordinance titled not entitled, it reads entitled it should read titled.

Corina Noyd stated (inaudible) I would assume this was done with the guidance of legal counsel. Since the town has suffered financial losses has there been any attempt to look into (inaudible).

Chair Mary Ann Rosa answered we have three different law firms advising us not just one attorney.

Chair Mary Ann Rosa stated I'm a rate payer too, I live on social security. I am upset as everyone else and I am not only upset about the lawsuit the judgement, I am upset about what it is doing to our town and to the trust the people have in our government. Whether you are a Democrat or a Republican you are working hard to do a good job. You give your time and effort and you stay away from your family and you sit here when you are sick because you care. You never make a decision

that you are going to hurt yourself and your family and your friends and your relatives. The decisions were made by the various counsels; we are under the government and guidance of three different law firms. We were advised on a monthly basis and we were basing our guidance from what was written in Connecticut law to benefit us. But a Waterbury judge didn't see it that way, he saw it to the benefit of Waterbury. I am with you I am concerned; I am not looking forward to how I am going to paying the bill. I have no choice and I don't think we do and we need to get back on our feet and take care of our obligations. Then we can look at the best way to move forward and the cheapest way we can move forward for our town. Believe me we do keep that in mind, we do try. We spent hours trying to figure it out whether you believe it or not. I have given a lot of years and I have always been honest whether I agreed with you or whether I didn't. I am telling you now, this was never done without what we thought what was best for the rate payers. For seven years Waterbury didn't get to charge residents that high, high rate and they ignored every effort we made to try and to come to some type of an agreement over and over every single week and month. The attorneys were calling and trying to set up meetings and they refused to meet. They didn't want to hear it and the court went along with them in the end because Mary Ann Rosa happens to believe that it was a Waterbury judge. Whatever the outcome is we abide by the law and we need to pay our obligation. I am hoping enough people in town support the ordinance and pass the bonding we can do what we have to do to get back on our feet. Regardless of what political party sits here they are going to have the same issues and the same problems to get us back where we belong. We have to work together to get to that spot and that means paying the bond. We have been asked by the attorney to do a roll vote.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Aye: 8 Rosa, Demirs, Desena, DiBona, Lafferty, Noyd, Retallick, Ryan

Nay: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passed unanimously

5. Consider a resolution regarding the adoption of the proposed bond ordinance entitled:

AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING \$10,000,000 FOR VARIOUS ROAD IMPROVEMENTS AND RELATED WORK; AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUE OF BONDS OR NOTES AND TEMPORARY NOTES IN THE SAME AMOUNT TO FINANCE THE APPROPRIATION

Motion: Ken Demirs seconded by Robert Retallick: I make a motion to approve the resolution regarding the adoption of the proposed bond ordinance titled:

AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING \$10,000,000 FOR VARIOUS ROAD IMPROVEMENTS AND RELATED WORK; AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUE OF BONDS OR NOTES AND TEMPORARY NOTES IN THE SAME AMOUNT TO FINANCE THE APPROPRIATION

Robert Desena stated it should read titled not entitled.

Corina Noyd stated I am looking at the last sentence for the bonding ordinance, I understand the language that was provided by the bonding attorney. That one sentence seemed that is a 20-year bond?

Mark Raimo answered yes that is correct.

Corina Noyd stated there is a lot of discretion given to the Town Manager when (audible) I think the language of that final sentence could be tighten up.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Aye: 8 Rosa, Demirs, Desena, DiBona, Lafferty, Noyd, Retallick, Ryan

Nay: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passed unanimously

6. Consider a resolution setting a referendum and ballot questions for the resolutions approved under Agenda Items a-b.

Motion: Ken Demirs seconded by Robert Desena: I make a motion that the ordinances considered under items 4 and 5 on today's agenda be submitted to the electors for approval or disapproval at referendum to be held Tuesday, September 16, 2025, and shall be published in full within ten days in a newspaper having circulation within the Town. The Town Clerk shall publish notice of the referendum. The ballot headings for the ordinances submitted under said items shall read as follows:

1. "SHALL THE TOWN OF WATERTOWN APPROPRIATE \$34,000,000 FOR SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION AGAINST THE TOWN IN THE CASE OF CITY OF WATERBURY V. TOWN OF WATERTOWN AND FOR RELATED COSTS; AND AUTHORIZE THE ISSUE OF BONDS OR NOTES AND TEMPORARY NOTES IN THE SAME AMOUNT TO FINANCE THE APPROPRIATION?"

2. "SHALL THE TOWN OF WATERTOWN APPROPRIATE \$10,000,000 FOR VARIOUS ROAD IMPROVEMENTS AND RELATED WORK; AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUE OF BONDS OR NOTES AND TEMPORARY NOTES IN THE SAME AMOUNT TO FINANCE THE APPROPRIATION?"

Electors approving the ordinance shall vote "Yes" and those opposed to the ordinance shall vote "No". Polls shall be open between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m.

Discussion: none.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Aye: 8 Rosa, Demirs, Desena, DiBona, Lafferty, Noyd, Retallick, Ryan
Nay: 0
Abstain: 0

Motion passed unanimously

7. Consider a resolution authorizing explanatory text and materials for the bond referendum for Agenda Items a-b.

Motion: Ken Demirs seconded by Robert Retallick: I move that the following resolution be approved:

RESOLVED, that the Office of the Town Clerk is directed to prepare and distribute a concise explanatory text regarding the questions for the approval or disapproval of the ordinances considered under items 4 and 5 at tonight's meeting to be submitted to the electors at the September 16, 2025 referendum vote, and the Town Manager is authorized, in such official's discretion, to prepare and distribute additional explanatory materials regarding said questions, such text and explanatory material to be subject to the approval of the Town Attorney and to be prepared and distributed in accordance with Section 9-369b of the General Statutes of Connecticut, Revision of 1958, as amended.

Discussion: none.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Aye: 8 Rosa, Demirs, Desena, DiBona, Lafferty, Noyd, Retallick, Ryan

Nay: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passed unanimously

8. Adjournment.

Motion: Ken Demirs seconded by Gary Lafferty: to adjourn the Special Meeting at 8:50 p.m.

Motion passed unanimously

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Ann Rosa, Chair
Watertown Town Council

Approved: _____
Susan King, Clerk