



State of New Jersey
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

INITIAL DECISION

OAL DKT. NO. ADC 03247-13

AGENCY DKT. NO. SADC ID

#1372A

NEIGHBORHOOD OPPOSITION GROUP,

Petitioner,

v.

**HIONIS GREENHOUSES, INC. AND
HUNTERDON COUNTY AGRICULTURE
DEVELOPMENT BOARD,**

Respondents.

William Carver, on behalf of petitioners Neighborhood Opposition Group, pro se

Gaetano DeSapio, Esq., for respondent Hionis Greenhouse

No Appearance by or on behalf of Aaron R. Culton, Assistant County Counsel, for
respondent Hunterdon County Agriculture Development Board (Shana Taylor,
County Counsel)

Record Closed: April 18, 2019

Decided: June 3, 2019

BEFORE **SARAH G. CROWLEY**, ALJ:

STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

This matter arises out of an appeal from a decision by the Hunterdon County Agriculture Development Board (CADB), by the petitioners, Neighborhood Opposition Group (petitioners). An application of Hionis Greenhouses Inc. for the construction of greenhouses on its property was approved by the CADB on July 12, 2012. The decision of the CADB was memorialized in two resolutions adopted by the HCADB on August 9, 2012, and December 13, 2012.

On February 8, 2013, petitioners filed a notice of Appeal with the State Agricultural Development Commission (SADC) challenging the approval of the Hionis' application for Site-Specific Agriculture Management Practice (SSAMP). Petitioners requested a hearing, and the matter was transmitted to the Office of Administrative Law on March 6, 2013 pursuant to N.J.S.A. 52:14B-1 to -15; N.J.S.A. 52:4F-1 to -13. A Motion for Summary Decision filed by the respondent seeking dismissal as a matter of law was denied on May 8, 2017. A site visit was conducted on April 1, 2017. Hearings were held on April 3, 2019 and April 5, 2019, and the record closed after written submissions by the parties on April 18, 2019.

FACTUAL DISCUSSION

On February 9, 2012, an application for SSAMP was submitted to the CADB by Hionis, the owners of Block 4, Lot 20, in the Township of Clinton. The applicant sought approval to construct several greenhouses on the property to be used as part of their farming operation. Prior to the application for SSAMP, Hionis was certified as a commercial farm, and that determination is not being challenged herein. Public hearings on the SSAMP application were heard on May 22, 2012, June 14, 2012, and July 12, 2012. Counsel for Hionis and the Township of Clinton were also present at the public hearings. The petitioners were represented by counsel at the hearing before the CADB.

The resolution, from the CADB dated February 9, 2012, provided as follows:

2. During its deliberations on the application, the Board discussed the imposition of the following conditions, which it

determined were unreasonable to impose on Hionis in connection with their application for the construction of commercial greenhouses at the property:

- A. The requirement of a traffic study to assess the impact on traffic traveling to and from the Farm.
- B. Restrictions or requirements about the number and frequency of delivery vehicles to and from the property, the size and weight of the delivery vehicles, and the hours of operation for the truck traffic assessing the property via Muirfield Lane.

(Resolution at page 9 of 9.)

The CADC resolution also provided that based on the testimony, “there are legitimate concerns about the impact on the community as a result of the increase traffic along Muirfield Lane with the expansion of the Hionis Greenhouse operation at the property.” The CADC further noted that the applicant must also obtain site plan approval. Application was subsequently made to the Clinton Township Planning Board for site plan approval. Hearings were conducted before the Clinton Township Planning Board, and the application was granted on September 15, 2013. No appeal was made to the Hunterdon County Superior Court from this site plan approval.

The resolution from the Clinton Township Planning Board noted its “jurisdiction over traffic ingress and egress to the site, traffic, circulation, parking and buffering.” With respect to such issues, testimony on the issue of traffic was presented and considered by the Clinton Township Planning Board and the Board resolved as follows with respect to truck traffic on the property as follows:

The applicant shall coordinate deliveries so that an employee(s) is present at the time vehicles arrive at the site. There shall be no trucks owned or operated by the applicant stopping, standing and/or idling on Muirfield Lane, Gleneagles Drive, Heather Hill Way and/or Blossom Hill Road. Further, the applicant shall advise all delivery companies that there shall be no trucks stopping, standing and/or idling on Muirfield Lane, Gleneagles Drive, Heather Hill Way and/or Blossom Hill Road.”

In addition, with respect to these conditions on the approval, the Planning Board noted that "it did not have the authority to impose any condition on the ingress, egress, truck traffic, as the use was a permitted use on the site." The Board further noted that authority to impose such conditions did not include the authority to "deny a site plan approval due to traffic issues," and that the permitted use was determined by the governing board and was preexisting. The Planning Board considered the issues raised with respect to trucks and traffic to and from the site and noted that the commercial farming operating was a permitted use, and it was not appropriate to mandate any sort of traffic study in this case.

Although the undersigned has no authority to review the decision of the Planning Board, I note that the decision was not appealed. I further note, that although the SADC had the right to preempt the Board on the issues relating to land use and traffic, they never stated that they were doing so. The Planning Board noted the legal limitations to restricting trucks and traffic to the site and imposed some limited restrictions. It is clear from the testimony and the resolution that the SADC considered traffic issues and heard testimony. Assuming that SADC exercised preemption over the local authority, they considered and determined that there was no basis to reject the applicant or restrict traffic on the site, and no basis to order a traffic study. Regardless of who had the right to consider such issues, both the Planning Board and the SADC considered and rejected the issues relating to traffic on the property. I only have jurisdiction to review whether the decision of the SADC and to determine if this decision was arbitrary, capricious or unreasonable.¹

¹ The majority of the petitioner's brief relates to the action or inaction of the planning board as it relates to the site and a 1971 Deed. I have no jurisdiction to review the action or inaction of the local planning or zoning board. A challenge to the decision of the zoning officer or the planning board must be made in the form of an Action in Lieu of a Prerogative Writ to the Superior Court of New Jersey. No such appeal was filed.

TESTIMONY AND FINDINGS OF FACT

For petitioner

Peter Hionis, his parents and his two brothers purchased the Hionis property in 2005. They operate a horticultural plant business on the property and he is the head of operations. They have two sites, one in Whitehouse and one in Clinton. They grow seasonal plants and flowers. He has been working there since 1990. They start the plants at the Clinton location and they truck them over to the commercial facility. They would move approximately 200,000 mum plants from the site to the other facility. There is not much going on at the site in December through February, and they start to grow again on the site in May. They would start them somewhere else, truck them over, after growing on the site, they would ship them back to the commercial facility or directly to customers. In 2010, they wanted to either increase the production on the site or change facilities. They did some grading and wanted to build greenhouses.

Initially when they filed an application for the gutter greenhouses, the town told them they were not a permitted use, but later reversed that decision. They also applied to the SADC, and were told that they needed to obtain site plan approval from the township planning board. They went before the Clinton Township Planning Board and received preliminary and final site plan approval. They also went to the County Agricultural Development Board, who approved the application as well. He acknowledges some discussions about alternate access, but there were DEP issues with that.

Mayor John Higgins was the chairman of the Planning Board when the Hionis application for site plan approval was filed. He recalled that greenhouses were not allowed in the residential zone, but were permitted on a farm. After the zoning board reversed itself on the permitted use issue, the matter was sent to the planning board for site plan approval. He recalls the issues relating to the traffic and thought that these issues were referred to the SADC. Upon review of the resolutions, he qualified his answer as it did appear that they considered and included some provision relating to traffic in their resolution. He identified the 1971 deed which had some language regarding alternate access to the Hionis site. However,

he had no specific knowledge or recollection about it. There were several parcels, and some were rezoned RR.

David Penna is a member of the neighborhood opposition group and a state trooper. However, he no longer lives in the neighborhood. He testified regarding the trucks that came on and off the site, the size of them and the extent of the truck traffic in their residential neighborhood. There were times when there were trucks parked in front of his house at night and he had to call the police. He described an incident with one of the trucks when his young son was playing in the leaves as he waited for the bus and was almost hit by a Hionis truck. He testified that when he moved into his house in 2009, there was virtually no truck traffic, but then it increased significantly. He had many conversations with the mayor and people at the town about how bad the truck traffic was in their neighborhood. There was a problem with the DEP on the alternate access which was discussed.

Bill Carver is a property owner. His property is adjacent to the Hionis site on Muirfield Lane. He moved into his home in September 2005. The activity on the site was minimal at that time. Then between 2011 and 2012 he noticed the intensity of the activity increased. The amount of dump trucks to and from the site was staggering. He acknowledged that there was quite a bit of activity even before the site plan and SADC approvals. He testified that as recent as yesterday, there were thirty dump trucks back and forth on the site. He has called the police several times over trailer trucks showing up after hours and just parking on the street overnight. The police confirmed that they had no right to just sit on the street like that. There was a lot of activity with the construction in 2011 and 2012. In addition to just bringing it in and out, there is a constant state of construction or some sort of activity on the site.

Steven Kneizys is a property owner as well and is a member of the neighborhood opposition group. Mr. Kneizys provided a great deal of testimony regarding the prior approval on the property and the 1971 deed. He testified that originally there was supposed to be alternate access to the site and it was never intended for Muirfield to be the only access. He feels that the current access violates the original deed to the Hionis, and that the reference to alternate access in the 1971 deed created an obligation to find some alternate access. The Resolution dated June 23, 1971, was admitted into evidence over the objection of the respondent. The original deed from Gene Novello, indicated that if a suitable alternate

access can be provided, that the existing strip would be vacated as use for road purposes. Alternate access was never obtained, and the original access to the property on Muirfield Lane remains.

John H. Rea is an engineer from the firm of McDonough and Rea Associates. He was qualified as an expert in the field of traffic. He was retained by the homeowners to conduct a study on the traffic impact at the Hionis Farm site located in Clinton Township. He discussed the residential nature of the neighborhood and that there are no sidewalks in the neighborhood. He conducted a study of traffic to and from the site for seven weeks between August and September of 2014. He noted the number of trips per day and the numbers of trucks in and out of the site. His expert report was entered into evidence as P-10. He compared the averages for single family neighborhoods and noted that the Hionis site is exceeding the average for a single-family neighborhood. He testified that in his expert opinion the Hionis farm operation is inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood, and the significant trucking activity exceeded normal levels for residential neighborhoods. This excessive truck traffic was inconsistent with the neighborhood and negatively impacted the safety and character of the neighborhood. The traffic impact of the Hionis Farms property is contrary to the low speed and low volume function of the Gleneagles Drive, Heather Hill Way and Muirfield Lane.

For respondent, Hionis Greenhouses, Inc.

Gary Dean testified on behalf of the respondent. He was qualified as an expert in civil engineering and traffic. He testified that he had inspected the site and was familiar with the neighborhood. He conducted an independent evaluation of the activity on the site in question. He installed the automatic traffic recorder which measures total traffic to and from the site. Data was collected from April 9, 2017 to April 16, 2017. He testified that there was a range of vehicles from twelve to twenty-two a day to and from the Hionis property. He testified that the type of traffic in and out is more important than the number. He explained that the property was zoned for agricultural use, and prior to the planned construction of the greenhouses, the business had operated on the site. There was truck traffic to and from the site before the application which is the subject matter of this proceeding.

His study analyzed traffic for the week of April 9, 2017 to April 16, 2017. He analyzed the volume as well as the nature of the vehicles going to and from the site. He concluded that in his expert opinion the traffic is not unreasonable and does not create an issue of public safety for the neighborhood or its residents. Dean explained that his results were very similar to that of the petitioner's experts, and in his expert opinion the trucks and other traffic were not a safety concern. Moreover, the nature of the business had not changed on the site.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The resolution of the claim regarding the traffic to and from the property requires that I make a credibility determination regarding the testimony of the expert witnesses of the petitioners and the respondent. The choice of accepting or rejecting the witnesses' testimony or credibility rests with the finder of fact. Freud v. Davis, 64 N.J. Super. 242, 246 (App. Div. 1960). In addition, for testimony to be believed, it must not only come from the mouth of a credible witness, but it also must be credible by itself. It must elicit evidence that is from such common experiences and observation that it can be approved as proper under the circumstances. See Spagnuolo v. Bonnet, 16 N.J. 546 (1954); Gallo v. Gallo, 66 N.J. Super. 1 (App. Div. 1961). A credibility determination requires an overall assessment of the witnesses' story in light of its rationality, internal consistency and the manner in which it "hangs together" with the other evidence. Carbo v. United States, 314 F.2d 718,749 (1963). A fact finder is free to weigh the evidence and to reject the testimony of a witness, even though not directly contradicted, when it is contrary to circumstances given in evidence or contains inherent improbabilities or contradictions which alone or in connection with other circumstances in evidence excite suspicion as to its truth. In re Perrone, 5 N.J. 514. 521-22 (1950). See D'Amato by McPherson v. D'Amato, 305 N.J. Super. 109, 115 (App. Div. 1997).

Based upon the testimony of evidence presented, I **FIND** that the respondent's expert witness was more credible than the petitioner's. They both came up with essentially the same data, yet respondent's expert opined that the traffic was not unreasonable for the neighborhood and did not create any issues of public safety. I **FIND** the testimony of the respondent's expert more credible. With respect to the remaining witnesses, they were all sincere and credible and I **FIND** their testimony as **FACT**.

Based on the evidence and the testimony, I **FIND** the following as **FACT**:

1. On February 5, 2012, Hionis filed a request for a Site-Specific Agricultural Management Practice with the Hunterdon County Agricultural Development Board (CADB).
2. The application sought permission to construct gutter connected greenhouses on Block 4, Lot 20 in Clinton Township.
3. Hionis is certified as a commercial farm and has been operating as such for at least ten years.
4. The Township determined that the proposed use was permitted and issued a zoning permit but required them to obtain site plan approval from the local planning board.
5. On December 13, 2012, the CADB granted the request for the construction of greenhouses on the site. The Board considered the issues of trucks and traffic to and from the site.
6. On September 16, 2013, after an open public meeting, the Planning Board granted site plan approval for the construction of the greenhouses, noting that it was a permitted use under the local ordinance. The Planning Board also considered trucks and traffic issues, and included some restrictions on same in its resolution.
7. No appeal was taken from the site plan approval of the Clinton Township Planning Board.
8. The instant appeal by the objectors from the CADB resolution was filed on February 8, 2013.

9. There are no significant issues of public safety presented by the pre-existing farm operations by Hionis.

10. The commercial farming operation is a permitted use on the site.

LEGAL ANALYSIS

The instant matter is an appeal from the December 13, 2012, decision of the CADB on a SSAMP application. This matter was also presented to the local planning board, which approved the site plan application on September 12, 2013. Although the CADB has the right to preempt local planning and zoning under the Right to Farm Act, it was unclear whether they had done so, and thus, a hearing was necessary. It is undisputed that the decision of the local planning board is not subject to review by the undersigned and was not appealed by the petitioners or anyone else. It is clear after the hearing that in addition to Planning Board consideration of traffic issues, the CADB likewise considered the issues relating to truck traffic and ingress and egress to the property. The planning board ordered some limited restrictions on trucks at the property, as did the CACB. The Planning Board noted that the property is zoned for commercial farming purposes and that the board had no authority to restrict traffic ingress and egress to the property. It did however, issue some limited restrictions.

With respect to the CADB decision which is the subject matter of the within appeal, they found and resolved that it would be unreasonable to impose any restrictions and/or require a traffic study. With respect to the scope and standard of review of this proceeding, Judge Mason clarified the standard of review in an Order dated October 17, 2013. He ruled that this is a "de novo hearing," . . . and the burden of proof is on the petitioner to establish by a preponderance of the credible evidence that the CADB's decision was arbitrary, capricious, or unreasonable," based upon a review of the record of the CADB and or any proofs presented at the hearing on this matter.

The Right to Farm Act, N.J.S.A. 4:1C-1 to -10.4 (RTFA), and the regulations promulgated thereunder, N.J.A.C. 2:76-2.1 to -2B.3, are designed to protect "commercial farm operations from nuisance action, where recognized methods and techniques of

agricultural production are applied, while, at the same time, acknowledging the need to provide a proper balance among the varied and sometimes conflicting interests of all lawful activities in New Jersey.” N.J.S.A. 4:1C-2(e). The RTFA “renders its provisions preeminent to ‘any municipal or county ordinance, resolution, or regulation to the contrary’” and its “provisions [are] preeminent over a municipality under the Municipal Land Use Law, N.J.S.A. 40:55D-1 to -112.” Bor. of Closter v. Abram Demaree Homestead, Inc., 365 N.J. Super. 338, 347 (App. Div. 2004), certif. denied, 179 N.J. 372 (2004) (citing N.J.S.A. 4:1C-9; Twp. of Franklin v. Den Hollander, 172 N.J. 147 (2002)). However, the protections of the RTFA extend only to an agricultural operation that qualifies as a “commercial farm.” In re Tavalario, 386 N.J. Super. 435, 441 (App. Div. 2006).

Under the RTFA, a “commercial farm” is “a farm management unit of no less than five acres producing agricultural or horticultural products worth \$2,500 or more annually and satisfying the eligibility criteria for differential property taxation pursuant to the ‘Farmland Assessment Act of 1964,’ P.L. 1964, c. 48 (C. 54:4-23.1, et seq.)” N.J.S.A. 4:1C-3; N.J.A.C. 2:76-2.1. The RTFA “does not require an applicant to apply for and obtain farmland assessment, but only that he meets the eligibility criteria for farmland assessment.” In re Arno, ADC 4748-03, Final Decision (February 26, 2004), <<http://njlaw.rutgers.edu/collections/oal/>>.

Upon making a decision, the CADB forwards its determination to the farm owner, the State Agriculture Development Committee (SADC), and any other appropriate party. N.J.A.C. 2:76-2.3(e). Any person aggrieved by the CADB’s determination may file an appeal with the SADC in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, N.J.S.A. 52:14B-1 to -15 (APA). N.J.S.A. 4:1C-10.2; N.J.A.C. 2:76-2.3(f). Thus, if the SADC determines that the appeal constitutes a contested case, the committee may transmit the matter to the Office of Administrative Law for a hearing. N.J.S.A. 52:14B-2; N.J.A.C. 1:1-2.1. After conducting a de novo hearing, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) assigned to the matter shall issue an initial decision that includes his recommended findings of fact and conclusions of law. N.J.S.A. 52:14B-10(c). The initial decision is filed with the SADC, which may adopt, modify, or reject the initial decision and whose decision shall be

considered a final administrative agency decision. N.J.A.C. 2:76-2.3(f); N.J.S.A. 4:1C-10.2; N.J.S.A. 52:14B-10(c).

As in many cases of this nature, this case reflects the close relationship between The Right to Farm Act, N.J.S.A. 4:1C-1 to -10.4 (RTFA), and the local municipal land use law (MLUL). The regulations promulgated under the RTFA, are designed to protect "commercial farm operations from nuisance action, where recognized methods and techniques of agricultural production are applied, while, at the same time, acknowledging the need to provide a proper balance among the varied and sometimes conflicting interests of all lawful activities in New Jersey." N.J.S.A. 4:1C-2. The RTFA was enacted to promote to the greatest extent practicable and feasible, the continuation of agriculture in the State of New Jersey while recognizing the potential conflicts among all lawful activities in the State." Township of Franklin v. Hollander, 338 N.J. Super. 373, 383 (App. Div. 2001), *aff'd* 172 N.J. 147 (2002).

In this case, we must begin with the acknowledgement that the property in question is zoned for commercial agricultural use and has been operating as such for the last ten years. The resolution from the CADB indicates that they heard testimony on the issue of traffic affecting the surrounding residential neighborhood. After hearing testimony, the CADB decided that it would be unreasonable to require a traffic study or to place restrictions on truck traffic on this site. The site is zoned for the proposed use, and it was the installation of the greenhouses on land already used for commercial farming, which generated the application to the CADC. During the deliberations before the CADC on May 22, 2012, the Board considered and heard testimony from five neighbors regarding the truck and traffic issues on the site. The testimony included testimony about the character of the neighborhood, the absence of sidewalks, the bus stops and the negative impact of the Hionis operations on their property.

After consideration of all the testimony, the Board noted the legitimate concerns of the neighbors, but concluded that it would be unreasonable to impose restrictions on the truck access to the property, or to require a traffic study on the impact of the farm. The CADC did restrict loading and unloading of vehicles on Muirfield Lane. There has been no demonstration by the petitioner that this decision by the SADC was arbitrary, capricious or unreasonable. On the contrary, the decision of the SADC was predicated on the evidence


presented, which included the zoning on the property, the existing commercial activity on the site and the limited ability to restrict use of property based on a traffic issue, where the use is consistent with the zone.

Based upon the testimony and the undisputed facts, I **CONCLUDE** that the action of the SADC was not arbitrary, unreasonable or capricious, and thus, their decision is **AFFIRMED**, and the appeal is **DISMISSED**.

I hereby **FILE** my initial decision with the **STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE** for consideration.

This recommended decision may be adopted, modified or rejected by the **STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**, which by law is authorized to make a final decision in this matter. If the State Agriculture Development Committee does not adopt, modify or reject this decision within forty-five days and unless such time limit is otherwise extended, this recommended decision shall become a final decision in accordance with N.J.S.A. 52:14B-10.

Within thirteen days from the date on which this recommended decision was mailed to the parties, any party may file written exceptions with the **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE, Health/Agriculture Building, PO Box 330, Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0330**, marked "Attention: Exceptions." A copy of any exceptions must be sent to the judge and to the other parties.



June 3, 2019 _____

DATE

SARAH G. CROWLEY, ALJ

Date Received at Agency: _____

Date Mailed to Parties: _____

SGC/cb

APPENDIX

WITNESSES

For petitioner:

Peter Hionis
Mayor John Higgins
David Penna
Bill Carver
Steven Kneizys
John H. Rea

For respondent, Hionis Greenhouses, Inc.:

Gary Dean

EXHIBITS

For petitioner:

- P-1 Hunterdon County Agriculture Development Board Resolution of December 13, 2012
- P-2 Conveyance from Gene Novello, Inc. to Hionis Farms, LLC. Book 2129, Page 405, in the Hunterdon County Registry of Deeds
- P-3 Section of Clinton Township Tax Map depicting the same general area as P-4. Original map was obtained from the Clinton Township website.
- P-4 Section of Clinton Township Zoning Map showing the Hionis lots 20, 22 (marked in RED) and surrounding neighborhood lots. Includes markups made during the hearing. Original (P-5) was obtained from the Clinton Township website.
- P-5 Clinton Township Zoning Map, dated June 7, 2012. Obtained from the Clinton Township website.
- P-6 Clinton Township Zoning Permit, dated February 23, 2012. Obtained through prior discovery and exhibit exchange in this matter.

- P-7 Cover letter with Sketch Plats, dated March 11, 1971. These pertain to the Heather Hill and 4-Lot subdivisions, diagrams 1500-B and 1510-B, respectively, for Gene Novello. Obtained from the Clinton Township archives via an OPRA request.
- P-8 Clinton Township Planning Board Resolution of June 15, 1971. Obtained from the Clinton Township archives via an OPRA request.
- P-9 Upper: Drawing 1500-B, proposed Heather Hill subdivision, dated January 25, 1971. Lower: Drawing 1510-B, proposed 4-Lot Subdivision dated March 9, 1971. Plot Maps Obtained from the Clinton Township archives via an OPRA request.
- P-10 Traffic Impact Analysis by John H. Rea, PE and Jay S. Troutman, Jr., PE, of McDonough & Rea Associates, Inc., dated January 25, 2015.
- P-11 Picture outside Hionis Entrance at 5 Muirfield, dated March 27, 2018 at 2:30pm
- P-12 Picture outside Hionis Entrance at 5 Muirfield, dated March 27, 2018 at 2:42pm
- P-13 Picture outside Hionis Entrance at 5 Muirfield, dated March 27, 2018 at 5:37pm
- P-14 Letter from NJDEP to Hionis Farms, dated February 12, 2013
- P-15 Clinton Township Planning Board Minutes for May 20, 1971. Obtained from shelves of the Clinton Township Planning minutes via an OPRA request.
- P-16 Clinton Township Planning Board Minutes for June 15, 1971. Obtained from shelves of the Clinton Township Planning minutes via an OPRA request.

For respondent, Hionis Greenhouses, Inc:

- H-1 Hunterdon County Agriculture Development Board Commercial Farm Certification (Form C), dated April 3, 2019
- H-2 Clinton Township Planning Board, Application No. 2012-12, Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval, Resolution No. 2013-10
- H-3 Gary W. Dean CV
- H-4 Hionis traffic report
- H-5 Hionis Daily Total Classes Report