

**MADISON INLAND WETLANDS AGENCY  
REGULAR MEETING  
Monday, February 5, 2007  
Meeting Room A, Town Campus**

A regular meeting of the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency (IWA) was held on Monday, February 5, 2007 at 7:30 p.m. in Meeting Room A, Madison Town Campus. With Vice Chairman Thomas Paul presiding, the meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m.

Present: Thomas Paul, John Mathieu, David Newton, Glenn Falk and Ken Munro. Inland Wetlands Officer Robert Kuchta and Assistant Town Engineer Mike Ott were also present. Rodney Bascom joined the meeting at 8:15p.m.

In order to expedite the agenda, applications and agenda items were addressed in order as needed.

**REGULAR MEETING**

3. **07-02: 1185 DURHAM ROAD.** Map 130, Lot 14. Owner/Applicant: Christ Chapel of the Christian and Missionary Alliance. Amendment to Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Map of the Town of Madison. **Receipt only.**

Roger Nemergut, Nemergut Consulting, 208 Route 81, Killingworth, CT represented the applicant. The wetlands were delineated by Richard Snarski, Soil Scientist. The map showed two wetland areas of approximately 6,000 SF each.

Vice Chairman Paul – asked IWO Kuchta if the application was complete.  
IWO Kuchta – Yes, and he will be walking the site next week.

A motion was made by David Newton, seconded by John Mathieu, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to accept application 07-02: 1185 Durham Road and schedule it for a public hearing on the March 5, 2007 agenda with a site walk to be done by IWO Kuchta.

4. **07-03: 1185 DURHAM ROAD & 4 JOSHUA TRAIL.** Map 130, Lots 13 & 14. Owner/ Applicant: Christ Chapel of the Christian and Missionary Alliance. Regulated Activity Permit for parking lot improvements within 100 ft. of wetlands. **Receipt only.**

Roger Nemergut, Nemergut Consulting, 208 Route 81, Killingworth, CT represented the applicant. He explained that a portion of the existing parking lot encroaches into the 100' upland review area. There will be no increase in the amount of parking lot area and the amount of encroachment along with impervious area will be reduced. He pointed out the location of new parking area outside the review area. An existing catch basin will be relocated on top of a drain that is already there.

Vice Chairman Paul – asked IWO Kuchta if the application was complete.

IWO Kuchta – yes.

A motion was made by David Newton, seconded by Ken Munro, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously accept application 07-03: 1185 Durham Road & 4 Joshua Trail and schedule it on the agenda for the March 5, 2007 meeting.

#### **8. APPROVAL OF BILLS**

A motion was made by David Newton, seconded by John Mathieu, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to approve payment of the bills totaling \$725.25.

#### **9. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A motion was made by Glenn Falk, seconded by David Newton, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to approve the minutes of the January 8, 2007 meeting with the following corrections:

Page 5, Line 16 – 8” wide

Corrected – 8” diameter

Page 8, Line 9 - Should end in a question mark.

Page 8, Line 10 - M. Ott – That *would*

Corrected - M. Ott – That *could*

#### **10. DISCUSSION: DEP Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Model Municipal Regulations – Fourth Edition, May 1, 2006.**

Proposed regulations were provided for the Agency to review. Comments and changes should be ready for discussion at the next meeting.

#### **5. 702 SUMMER HILL ROAD.**

IWO Kuchta sent a letter last month but no response has been received.

#### **6. 2158 DURHAM ROAD.**

IWO Kuchta will address in the spring.

#### **11. SECTION 13 APPROVALS:**

**A. 07-01: 63 EAST WHARF ROAD.** Approved 1/11/07 for garage and grading within 100 ft. of a wetland.

IWO Kuchta – silt fence will be needed.

**B. 06-28A MOD.: 515 OLD TOLL ROAD.** Approved 1/23/07 for modification of driveway location.

IWO Kuchta – was approved by the Agency but modifications were since made in the driveway. These modifications are still being refined with the assistance of Town staff and when it is complete he will report to the IWA on the status.

#### **13. REMARKS – INLAND WETLANDS CHAIRMAN - none**

– **INLAND WETLANDS OFFICER** – reminder of a seminar scheduled for March

#### **PUBLIC HEARING**

**06-67: 78 LONG SHORE LANE.** Map 25, Lot 74 and 74-1. Owner: Long Shore, LLC; Applicant: Ed Zimmerman. Regulated Activity Permit for 1) extension of Maplewood Lane involving filling wetlands and road construction in and within 100 ft. of wetland, and 2) wetland crossing for driveway access to proposed lot 7. Subdivision referral for proposed 7 lot subdivision. **(continued from December 4, 2006 to February 5, 2007)**

Steven C. Sullivan, P.E., of CCA, LLC, 40 Old Milford Road, Brookfield, Connecticut, presented the application. He explained that the applicant has submitted three correspondences since the December 4<sup>th</sup> meeting. The first was an extension letter dated January 2, 2007; the second, dated January 5, 2007, addressed comments submitted by John Paul Garcia; the third, dated January 19, 2007, addressed comments by IWO Kuchta; another, dated January 2, 2007, was from Michael Klein.

IWO Kuchta – that correspondence is in the file.

D. Newton – will the extension allow enough time to complete the hearing?

IWO Kuchta – it will cover the March 5, 2007 meeting.

Steven C. Sullivan – explained changes made since the last meeting. Access from Shore Lands Drive was not granted and Lot 6 was eliminated resulting in the parcel being incorporated into Lot 4. There is now a 6-lot subdivision with 5 new home sites and one existing. Lot 7 from the original plan is now Lot 6. Additionally, they met with the Town Engineer and Fire Marshall to determine what improvements can be made to Long Shore Lane. The applicant is trying to maintain the existing tree line at the first part of the road. They are proposing a larger radius at the entrance for easier turning of vehicles. Pull offs were added to assist traffic in passing. A portion will be widened from the existing 10' to 12'. He pointed out pull off areas and areas of widening on the map.

G. Falk - how many trees will be taken down?

Steven C. Sullivan – no significant ones.

G. Falk – what is the applicant's position? Is this a Town road?

Steven C. Sullivan – yes. He continued, on the new Lot 6 there are approximately 4 trees to be removed within the construction area. Additionally, the applicant was asked to consider alternatives to the cul-de-sac so, a hammerhead option has been provided though the applicant feels the cul-de-sac would better serve the community for emergency services, maintenance and drainage. The wetlands impacted are of low value. Rain gardens are proposed for roof leaders on Lots 1, 2 and 6. The vegetated buffer strips will be planted with a wildlife mix and wetlands plaques will be mounted on the split-rail fencing around those areas.

J. Mathieu – does the applicant have documentation that Long Shore Lane is a Town road? Is there something in writing?

Steven C. Sullivan – yes.

J. Mathieu – wastewater calculations have been submitted?

Steven C. Sullivan – they are on the plans.

Michael Klein, biologist and soil scientist, Environmental Planning Services, for the applicant. Commenting on the letter he had provided for the file in January he stated that Mr. Bennett had previously advised the Agency that they may regulate an upland review area adjacent to tidal wetlands and that this is not true. He also noted that the minutes of the December meeting suggested there was a possibility of vernal pools on the property and there are none.

Vice Chairman Paul – those same minutes show that Mike Ott stated that the maximum length of road would be 750’ and this one is longer. The cul-de-sac is proposed to fill 2,000 SF of wetlands. That is a great deal of wetland area.

Steven C. Sullivan – the function and value of that wetland, in their opinion, is very low and mitigating it elsewhere along with the advantages of a cul-de-sac to the greater good, justify it.

Vice Chairman Paul – asked IWO Kuchta if he had visited the site recently and done any measuring?

IWO Kuchta – yes, out of concern for the narrowness of the road. Closer to Route 1 there is a place where the road is 10’ wide and the trees are 12’ apart.

Vice Chairman Paul – related to the subdivision referral, does Planning and Zoning have a required width on a Town road?

M. Ott – The Engineering Department considers this to be a driveway, not a Town road. This driveway has a right-of-way across property belonging to the Town of Madison. He is not sure exactly what the extents of their rights are. Planning and Zoning’s regulations with relation to road width are not applicable. In his opinion, this road is not a public road nor is it a private road; it is simply a driveway over Town property.

G. Falk – asked if he was aware of other similar circumstances in Madison.

M. Ott – not on Town land, at least not to his knowledge, though there may be, but it is still somewhat unusual. He assumes that the driveway access predates ownership by the Town of this property and that the right to cross came with the land. With regards to the referral portion of the application, the IWA should look at the layout of the subdivision and make a determination with regards to potential impact to the wetlands.

Vice Chairman Paul – if for some reason the entrance into the subdivision needs to be widened, there will be work there. Are there wetlands within 100’?

M. Ott – there are wetlands within 100’ but the driveway does not have to be widened because it is not a public road and subdivision regulations that include road widths, do not apply.

*Rodney Bascom joined the meeting in progress at 8:15 P.M.*

D. Newton – the IWA has to look at more than whether the wetlands activities themselves are feasible and prudent or the subdivision is feasible and prudent because if the subdivision, as it is proposed, is approved then that is not feasible because those lots may not be able to be accessed in that way, so it may be denied because the configuration is not feasible. How can the IWA approve a wetlands activity if, in fact, that lot is not a feasible lot and it is known that what is approved cannot be done anyway?

M. Ott – a decision must be made on what is before the IWA regardless of the status of the road. If the Town is right, the application would hold but if the Town is wrong the applicant would not be able to get Planning and Zoning approval as presented and if something different was required, they would have to come back to the IWA with a new proposal.

R. Bascom – Why wouldn’t the IWA get its attorney’s opinion as to the status of the roadway? Why assume anything when there are conflicting opinions? The IWA needs the Town’s legal interpretation. To which, the Agency concurred.

R. Bascom – would not be comfortable making a decision without the Town attorney’s opinion.

J. Mathieu – the applicant has stated that they have documentation to the fact that Long Shore Lane is a Town road. Is that documentation in the file?

Steven C. Sullivan – No, they felt it was a Planning and Zoning issue.

R. Bascom – Clarified, the IWA's jurisdiction is the wetlands. If, in fact, this is a Town road and it has to be brought up to Town standards there would be additional impact on the wetlands. The IWA can't determine that until they know the status of the roadway. It may be difficult to move the application forward with a positive referral without that answer.

D. Newton – the applicant is asking for more than a referral; they want approval to fill a wetland.

G. Falk – is troubled with Lot 6. Why would the IWA approve a lot there if wetlands are going to need to be filled?

Steven C. Sullivan – there is an alternative to the cul-de-sac and Lot 6 is a viable lot.

G. Falk - If the applicant's option is to fill a wetland he feels that the subdivision should be drawn another way to avoid that filling.

Vice Chairman Paul – asked for comments or questions from the public.

William Davis, 239 Mungertown Road & 33 Shorelands Drive.

Will the cul-de-sac or hammerhead go past where Maplewood Lane currently ends?

Steven C. Sullivan – yes, onto the applicant's property; approximately 100' will be added.

William Davis – questioned if the applicant would be required to improve drainage in the area if application is approved. He asked additional questions about elevations of the lots and if the lots were going to be raised and increase runoff?

Steven C. Sullivan – no, lots will not be raised and runoff/drainage will not be changed. He clarified setbacks for septic systems and houses on questioned lots.

Atty. Marjorie Shansky, 61 E. Grand Ave., New Haven, CT representing Claudia Beamis and Rob Weinstein, 50 Whedon Lane questioned if the locations of the houses and driveways are being submitted for approval.

D. Newton – no.

Jeff Rosenberg, 318 Boston Post Road – has an easement along Long Shore Lane that travels with the deed to the property. He noted they were not notified about any potential activity on this easement. The easements appear to have been in place before the Town owned it.

R. Bascom – are those easements on the applicant's plans?

Steven C. Sullivan – no. The A-2 survey was of the applicant's property not the Town's.

K. Munro – would granting this application affect this easement?

Jeff Rosenberg – it would change the use because it would become more of a trafficked road as opposed to a private drive for easy access to the beach.

R. Bascom – Would an easement holder have to be notified as an abutter? He asked IWO Kuchta to add this question to the list of questions for the Town attorney.

Dave Forest, 19 Maplewood Lane – questioned the dimensions of the hammerhead turnaround.

Steven C. Sullivan – approx. 30' long by 15' wide.

Rob Weinstein, 50 Whedon Dr. asked if the stone wall would be damaged by the road work.

Steven C. Sullivan – one small section where the wall is down and in rubble.

Carol Murphy, 30 Maplewood – the neighborhood would benefit from a regulation sized cul-de-sac. It is now a problem for delivery and emergency vehicles.

Vice Chairman Paul – the hammerhead would still provide the turning area needed. He has a problem with filling of the wetland for a cul-de-sac.

D. Newton – how big is the mitigation area?

Steven C. Sullivan – 4,100 SF.

K. Munro – what is the source of the document stating this is a Town road?

Atty. Les Hollo, for the applicant, noted the source was in Exhibit C of Attorney Crosby's letter, minutes of Board of Selectman's meeting dated May 15, 1972. This is one of the roads that were accepted by the Board of Selectmen at that meeting.

Vice Chairman Paul – asked about the extension date.

IWO Kuchta – it is currently extended to February 12<sup>th</sup> but can be extended to March 16<sup>th</sup>.

Ed Zimmerman, owner/applicant – questioned why the Town attorney hadn't been contacted previously.

IWO Kuchta – Town attorney was asked for clarification of the IWA's jurisdiction over tidal wetlands and watercourses. This was answered and now new questions have been raised.

Atty. Tom Crosby, 1291 Boston Post Road, for the Intervenor Lili Schlossberg Foggie of 107 Longshore Lane. Spoke in opposition to the application. He advised the Agency that accepting this application would also be accepting page P-1 of the plans "the Long Shore Lane Road Improvement Plan". He encouraged the Agency to review the application as a comprehensive plan in reviewing the affects of the regulated activity within the 100' review area. This proposal proposes the widening of a driveway on Town land which has not been approved by the Town nor has the request to do so been made. He quoted §5-5b "Acceptance of Roads – Board of Selectmen by an affirmative vote will accept them if they are approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission". This "road" was never approved. "and a maintenance bond shall be set". There was never a maintenance bond set for this "road". The Town has never plowed, paved, nor have the police patrolled Long Shore Lane. Easement holders were not contacted. The Town has never legally accepted it as a road. He provided **Exhibit 1 (2-5-07)** minutes from the Beach and Recreation Commission dated 1965 and **Exhibit 2 (2-5-07)** minutes from the Beach and Recreation Commission dated 1979. Those minutes showed that Town Counsel at that time stressed that acquisition of that property would be subject to the rights-of-way that had previously been granted through it. He asked that the Crosby and Cronan letter and packet dated January 22, 2007, currently in the file, be included as **Exhibit 3 (2-5-07)**. As the road is not, in his opinion, a Town road and thus is not as wide as a Town road would need to be, it would not be safe to put access to the proposed amount of houses through it, as emergency vehicles would, in some circumstances, be unable to gain access.

John Paul Garcia, PE, 190 Fairwood Road, Bethany, CT for the Intervenor

He provided **Exhibit 4 (2-5-07)**, his report with supporting documentation and photos, for the Agency's review. He noted that the applicant says runoff will sheetflow from the road. In his exhibit documentation he provided pictures showing the edges of Long Shore Lane which would prohibit sheetflow runoff if present drainage patterns are maintained. He felt the driveways shown are not adequate for protection of drainage and water quality of the area. Nothing is provided in the plans to address the increase in runoff due to the increase in impervious surface. Also, the plans do not show how existing and proposed stormwater increases will be handled; there is no erosion control plan; sequence of construction is not shown or how it will be built.

Vice Chairman Paul – how can the road be widened on Town property without the Town’s permission?

IWO Kuchta – the Town may have to co-apply.

R. Bascom – asked that that question be added to the list of questions for the Town attorney.

Marjorie Shansky, Atty for Weinstein and Beamis – Provided **Exhibit 5 (2-5-07)**, her comments on the application for the Agency’s review. She questioned the location of detention drains on the plans and concurred with comments made by Atty. Crosby and Mr. Garcia. She also felt the application was incomplete as the applicant did not provide evidence of demonstration of any feasible and prudent alternative. In the first instance, it is the purpose of the IWA to avoid wetland impact, in this case the filling of 2,000+ SF. A hammerhead turnaround option was provided but an alternative to that would be the elimination of the current Lot 6. Mitigation is to serve when wetland impact can’t be avoided and in this case it can be avoided. She cited comments made by Atty. Zizka in the January 6, 2006 IWA minutes where he acknowledged that a reduction in the number of lots in a subdivision is an option for the Agency. Finally, she raised the issue of designated catch basin inspections.

Rob Weinstein – expressed concern over the trees that will be lost and over the intersection of the inland wetlands with the tidal wetlands during storm surges and the impact that will have on the area north of Lot 6.

Vice Chairman Paul – questioned if it will be possible for all of the information to be available in time to make a decision at the next meeting and the applicant assured the Agency that they would have their portion on time.

J. Mathieu – there needs to be more information on the crossing at Lot 6.

Michael Klein – he will provide additional information for the next meeting. More detail will be added to the plans. He did not agree that detention basins were required in this area. Driveway radiuses will be added. He concurred that the applicant will be agreeable to another 30-day extension.

**Exhibit 1 (2-5-07)** minutes from the Beach and Recreation Commission dated 1965.

**Exhibit 2 (2-5-07)** minutes from the Beach and Recreation Commission dated 1979.

**Exhibit 3 (2-5-07)** the Crosby and Cronan letter and packet dated January 22, 2007.

**Exhibit 4 (2-5-07)** his report with supporting documentation and photos.

**Exhibit 5 (2-5-07)** her comments on the application

A motion was made by Ken Munro, seconded John Mathieu, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to extend the public hearing for application 06-67: 78 Long Shore Lane for an additional 30 days.

*The Agency adjourned for a 5-minute break.*

**06-85: 23 HAMILTON DRIVE**, a.k.a. 36 Cedar Lane. Map 27, Lot 79. Owners/Applicants: John D. & Elisabeth J. Morgan. Regulated Activity Permit for extension of water main within 100 ft. of wetlands. **Continued to the next meeting.**

*Rodney Bascom assumed the position as Chairman for the remainder of the meeting.*

A motion was made by Ken Munro, seconded John Mathieu, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to open the public hearing for application 06-89: 53 Green Hill Road.

**06-89: 53 GREEN HILL ROAD.** Map 54, Lot 11. Owner/Applicant: Lowry Family, LLP. Amendment to Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Map of the Town of Madison.

Eric Anderson, Anderson Engineering and Surveying Associates, Guilford, CT  
As representative for applicant he explained the wetlands were delineated by Rich Snarski.  
Chairman Bascom – read the field report into the record. He asked if there were members of the public who wished to comment on the application. There were no comments.

D. Newton – asked if the Town of Guilford would need to be notified since the property is on its border.

IWO Kuchta – that would be true of a regulated activity.

A motion was made by John Mathieu, seconded Ken Munro, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to close the public hearing for application 06-89: 53 Green Hill Road.

A motion was made by David Newton, seconded by John Mathieu, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to approve application 06-89: 53 Green Hill Road as submitted.

A motion was made by Thomas Paul, seconded David Newton, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to open the public hearing for application 06-90: Neck Road.

**06-90: NECK ROAD.** Map 12, Lot 46. Owner/Applicant: Lowry Family, LLP. Amendment to Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Map of the Town of Madison.

Eric Anderson, Anderson Engineering and Surveying Associates, Guilford, CT  
As representative for applicant he noted the wetlands were delineated by Rich Snarski.  
Chairman Bascom – read the field report into the record. He asked if there were members of the public who wished to comment on the application. There were no comments.

A motion was made by David Newton, seconded Ken Munro, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to close the public hearing for application 06-90: Neck Road.

A motion was made by John Mathieu, seconded by Ken Munro, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to approve application 06-90: Neck Road as submitted.

A motion was made by David Newton, seconded John Mathieu, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to open the public hearing for application 06-91: 15 Island Avenue.

**06-91: 15 ISLAND AVENUE.** Map 38, Lot 126. Owners/Applicants: Karen I. & A. Norman Redlich. Amendment to Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Map of the Town of Madison.  
**Receipt only.**

Mark Young, Russ Waldo Associates

As representative for applicant he explained that the wetlands were delineated by Elizabeth Young. There are no tidal wetlands.

Chairman Bascom – read the field report into the record. He asked if there were members of the public who wished to comment on the application. There were no comments. He noted that this property is a very good example of a wetland that is a lawn area. Colored photos will be provided for the Agency.

A motion was made by Thomas Paul, seconded by John Mathieu, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to close the public hearing for application 06-91:15 Island Avenue.

A motion was made by David Newton, seconded by John Mathieu, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to approve application 06-91: 15 Island Ave as submitted.

A motion was made by John Mathieu, seconded Thomas Paul, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to open the public hearing for application 06-93: 125 Twin Bridge Road.

**06-93: 125 TWIN BRIDGE ROAD.** Map 119, Lots 3 & 4. Owner/Applicant: R. Snowden Andrews, Jr. Amendment to Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Map of the Town of Madison.

Eric Anderson, Anderson Engineering and Surveying Associates, Guilford, CT

As representative for the applicant he explained the wetlands were delineated by Richard Snarski.

Chairman Bascom – Read the field report into the record. He asked if there were members of the public who wished to comment on the application. There were no comments.

A motion was made by John Mathieu, seconded Ken Munro, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to close the public hearing for application 06-93: 125 Twin Bridge Road.

A motion was made by Thomas Paul, seconded by David Newton, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to approve application 06-93: 125 Twin Bridge Road as submitted. .

### **REGULAR MEETING (continued)**

**06-94: 125 TWIN BRIDGE ROAD.** Map 119, Lots 3 & 4. Owners: R. Snowden & Carolyn B. Andrews. Regulated Activity Permit to allow addition to house within 100 ft. of wetlands.

Eric Anderson, Anderson Engineering and Surveying Associates, Guilford, CT

As representative for the applicant he explained the purpose of the application is to make changes to the house, most of which are out of the 100' upland review area; approximately 5' is encroaching. He pointed out, on the map, the locations of the additions.

J. Mathieu – questioned the location of the patio.

D. Newton – is there grass down to the pond?

Eric Anderson – beneath the trees and almost to the pond. There grass is not the type that needs to be mowed twice a week. In some areas there is a natural plant border along the pond's edge.

Chairman Bascom – construction access is upland?

Eric Anderson – yes.

A motion was made by Glenn Falk, seconded by Ken Munro, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to approve application 06-94: 125 Twin Bridge Road as submitted.

**06-92: 15 ISLAND AVENUE.** Map 38, Lot 126. Owner/Applicant: Norman Redlich.

Regulated Activity Permit for additions to dwelling within 100 ft. of wetlands.

Mark Young, Russ Waldo Associates

As representative for applicant he explained the proposed changes to the house.

D. Newton – will there be footings poured under the kitchen addition.

Mark Young – there will be footings with a crawl space.

Chairman Bascom – is the application complete.

IWO Kuchta – Yes.

A motion was made by John Mathieu, seconded by Ken Munro, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to approve application 06-92: 15 Island Avenue as submitted.

A motion was made by Thomas Paul, seconded David Newton, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to add 07-04 and 07-05: Town of Madison to the agenda

Mike Ott, Assistant Town Engineer – the Board of Education got a grant from the State to provide fiber optic connections between the Polson and the Ryerson schools and the Brown Middle School and between the Jeffrey Elementary and Polson Middle School. There will be a stream crossing.

A motion was made by David Newton, seconded John Mathieu, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to accept application 07-04: Town of Madison and schedule it on the agenda for the next IWA meeting.

A motion was made by David Newton, seconded John Mathieu, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to accept application 07-05: Town of Madison and schedule it on the agenda for the next IWA meeting.

A motion was made by John Mathieu, seconded by Ken Munro, whereby the Madison Inland Wetlands Agency voted unanimously to adjourn at 10:55 p.m.

The next IWA meeting will be on Monday, March 5<sup>th</sup>, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Donnette Stahnke  
Recording Secretary, Inland Wetlands Agency