



State of New Jersey
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL
101 SOUTH BROAD STREET
PO BOX 819
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0819

CHRIS CHRISTIE
Governor

KIM GUADAGNO
Lt. Governor

RICHARD E. CONSTABLE, III
Commissioner

NOTICE OF MEETING
Government Records Council
June 25, 2013

Pursuant to the Open Public Meetings Act, notice is hereby given that the Government Records Council will hold a regular meeting, at which formal action may be taken, commencing at 10:30 a.m., Tuesday, June 25, 2013, at the Department of Community Affairs ("DCA") offices located at 101 South Broad Street in Trenton, New Jersey.

The agenda, to the extent presently known, is listed below. The public session and consideration of cases is expected to commence at 10:30 a.m. in Room 129 of the DCA.

I. Public Session:

- Call to Order
- Pledge of Allegiance
- Meeting Notice
- Roll Call

II. Executive Director's Report

III. Public Comment (First Session):

- This first session of public comment is reserved solely for suggestions, views and comments relevant to proposed actions on the agenda. A second session of public comment will occur at the end of the meeting to provide an opportunity to present suggestions, views and comments relevant to the Council's functions and responsibilities.

IV. Closed Session

V. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings:

- May 28, 2013 Open Session Meeting Minutes

VI. New Business – Cases Scheduled for Consent Agenda Administrative Complaint Disposition Adjudication *

- An "Administrative Complaint Disposition" means a decision by the Council as to whether to accept or reject the Executive Director's recommendation of dismissal based on jurisdictional, procedural or other defects of the complaint. The Executive



Director's recommended reason for the Administrative Disposition is under each complaint below.

A. Administrative Disposition Adjudications with Recusals (Consent Agenda): None

B. Administrative Disposition Adjudications with no Recusals (Consent Agenda):

1. Gregory J. Levitzki v. Borough of Cresskill (Bergen) (2012-229)
 - No Correspondence Received by the Custodian Regarding This Request
2. Thomas Schroeder (On behalf of PBA Local #186) v. Borough of Paramus (Bergen) (2012-332)
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation
3. Kevin F. McCourt v. City of Hoboken (Hudson) (2012-331)
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn
4. Thomas Schroeder (On behalf of PBA Local #186) v. Borough of Paramus Police Department (2013-8)
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation
5. Jeffrey L. Olshansky (On behalf of Daryl T. Bowen) v. NJ Department of Corrections (2013-24)
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation
6. Thomas Schroeder (On behalf of PBA Local #186) v. Borough of Paramus Police Department (2013-51)
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation
7. Mary E. Calvano v. Franklin Lakes Public Schools (Bergen) (2013-94)
 - No Records Responsive to the Request Exist
8. Katie Aptsiauri v. Bernards Township Health Department (2013-96)
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn
9. Emily Koval v. NJ Department of Treasury, Division of Purchase & Property (2013-103)
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation
10. Jeannie Swint (On behalf of Construction Journal) v. Rowan University (2013-125)
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn
11. Craig A. Cataldo v. NJ Commission for the Blind & Visually Impaired (2013-132)
 - Not a Valid OPRA Request
12. Dr. Ernest Zirkle v. Township of Fairfield (Cumberland) (2013-137)
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn
13. Mark L. Tompkins v. Veterans Court House (Essex) (2013-160)
 - Not Within Council's Jurisdiction - Request Made to the Judiciary

VII. New Business – Cases Scheduled for Individual Complaint Adjudication

- The Executive Director's recommended action is under each complaint below.

A. Individual Complaint Adjudications with Recusals: None

B. Individual Complaint Adjudications with no Recusals:

14. William Gettler v. Township of Wantage (Sussex) (2009-73)

15. William Gettler v. Township of Wantage (Sussex) (2009-74) **Consolidated**

- The Council should accept the Administrative Law Judge's May 28, 2013 Initial Decision ordering a decision be entered in favor of the Custodian. As to redacted e-mail addresses where no name is displayed, the Custodian should provide the name of the individual "sender" or recipient."

16. Mary Steinhauer-Kula v. Township of Downe (Cumberland) (2010-196)

- This complaint should be dismissed as part of a stipulation of settlement signed by the parties. No further adjudication is required.

17. Mary Steinhauer-Kula v. Township of Downe (Cumberland) (2010-197)

- This complaint should be dismissed as part of a stipulation of settlement signed by the parties. No further adjudication is required.

18. Mary Steinhauer-Kula v. Township of Downe (Cumberland) (2010-199)

- This complaint should be dismissed as part of a stipulation of settlement signed by the parties. No further adjudication is required.

19. Lynn Markarian v. NJ Dep't of Law & Public Safety, Div. of Consumer Affairs (2011-312)

- The Custodian has complied with the terms of the Council's May 28, 2013 Interim Order because the Custodian provided the responsive regulations and certified confirmation of same to the Executive Director. Although the Custodian's prior actions resulted in a "deemed" denial and a partial unlawful denial of access, and the Custodian failed to fully comply with the Council's March 22, 2013 Interim Order, the Custodian lawfully denied access to all remaining OPRA request items and fully complied with the Council's May 28, 2013 Interim Order. There is no evidence that the Custodian's OPRA violations had a positive element of conscious wrongdoing or was intentional and deliberate. Therefore, the "deemed" denial did not rise to the level of a knowing and willful violation of OPRA and unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances.

20. Charles F. Hendricks v. City of Cape May (Cape May) (2011-338)

- This complaint should be dismissed because the Complainant withdrew the complaint via letter dated May 24, 2013. No further adjudication is required.

21. Bonnie L. Riley v. Oxford Township (Warren) (2012-120)

- No records responsive to the OPRA requests exist since the Custodian initially responded that no records responsive exist and further certified to that fact in the Statement of Information. The Complainant did not submit any evidence to refute the Custodian's certifications. Therefore, the Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the requested records.

22. Lauren J. Eastwood v. Borough of Englewood Cliffs (Bergen) (2012-121)

- The responsive drawings are exempt from access as "inter-agency or intra-agency advisory, consultative or deliberative" material. Thus, the Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the responsive records.

23. Jon Frey v. Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (2012-139)

- No unlawful denial of access occurred because the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission is a bi-state agency that is not subject to the provisions of OPRA.

24. John Coffey v. NJ Department of Health & Senior Services (2012-140)

- The Custodian did not prove that she timely responded to the Complainant's OPRA request. As such, the Custodian's failure to respond in writing to the OPRA request within the statutorily mandated seven (7) business days results in a "deemed" denial. However, the Custodian has proved that she provided all records not otherwise exempt from access under OPRA and there is no evidence to refute the Custodian's Statement of Information certification. Additionally, the Custodian lawfully denied access to those records otherwise exempt from access under OPRA and Executive Order No. 26. There is no evidence that the "deemed" denial had a positive element of conscious wrongdoing or was intentional and deliberate. Therefore, the "deemed" denial did not rise to the level of a knowing and willful violation of OPRA and unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances.

25. Stephen B. Levitt v. Montclair Parking Authority (Essex) (2012-150)

- The potential for unsolicited contact of a certain group of individuals registered with the Township for overnight parking warrants non-disclosure of the responsive full addresses. However, this potential does not extend to limited disclosure of just the names and town of residence. Thus, the Custodian has failed to prove that disclosure of the names and town of residence would violate the reasonable expectation of privacy of permit holders in the Township. The Custodian should disclose the responsive record or records, if any exist, containing names and town of residence but redacting home addresses for all parking permit holders. The Council should defer analysis of whether the Custodian knowingly and willfully violated OPRA and unreasonably denied access under the totality of the circumstances pending the Custodian's compliance with the Interim Order.

26. Anthony F. Argento v. Township of Bloomfield (Essex) (2012-165)

- The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the requested attendance records because said records are considered payroll records, which are available for public access. As such, the Custodian should disclose the 12 pages of responsive attendance records to the Complainant. The Custodian lawfully denied access to the requested training records because they are exempt from public access as personnel records. The Custodian has proved that said records do not demonstrate compliance with specific experiential, educational or medical qualifications required for public employment. The Council should defer analysis of whether the Custodian knowingly and willfully violated OPRA and unreasonably denied access under the totality of the circumstances pending the Custodian's compliance with the Interim Order.

27. William Borkowski v. Borough of Allentown (Monmouth) (2012-166)

- The Custodian did not prove that she timely responded to request item no. 6 of the Complainant's March 28, 2012 OPRA request. Although the Custodian timely responded to the OPRA request in writing advising that she needed an extension until April 19, 2012, to respond to same, the Custodian's failure to respond in writing within the extended time frame results in a "deemed" denial. The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the February 14, 2012 OPRA request because said request seeks information rather than specifically identifiable government records. The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to request item nos. 1-4 of the March 28,

2012 OPRA request because the Custodian proved that she provided the Complainant with all records responsive, or that the responsive record does not exist. The Custodian has failed to prove a lawful denial of access to request item no. 6 and must disclose the record responsive. The Council should decline to determine whether the Custodian unlawfully denied access to the Complainant's request for Executive Session minutes for the 2011 calendar year because the Complaint is devoid of any evidence that any such OPRA request was submitted. The Council should defer analysis of whether the Custodian knowingly and willfully violated OPRA and unreasonably denied access under the totality of the circumstances pending the Custodian's compliance with the Interim Order.

28. *Sabbir Rangwala v. Borough of Point Pleasant Beach (Ocean) (2012-171)*

- The Custodian did not prove that she timely responded to the OPRA request. The Custodian's failure to respond in writing to the OPRA request within the statutorily mandated seven (7) business days results in a "deemed" denial. The Custodian lawfully denied access to request item nos. 1-7 because said requests seek information rather than specifically identifiable government records. Further, the records responsive to request item nos. 5-7 do not exist.

29. *Sabino Valdes v. Township of Belleville (Essex) (2012-181)*

- The Council has no authority over the content of the record provided. Further, the Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the requested OPRA request form since the evidence of record supports that she provided same to the Complainant in a timely manner.

30. *Ricky Kurt Wassenaar v. NJ Department of Corrections (2012-187)*

31. *Ricky Kurt Wassenaar v. NJ Department of Corrections (2012-192)* **Consolidated**

- The Complainant's April 29, 2012 OPRA request items are valid because request item Nos. 1, 2 and 3 contained information that may allow the Custodian to identify responsive e-mails and memoranda. Thus, the Custodian shall provide those readily identifiable records that existed at the time of the OPRA request, if any. If the Custodian believes certain records are exempt from disclosure or that no records exist, the Custodian must legally certify to these facts. The Custodian has proved that the records responsive to the April 29, 2012 OPRA request item No. 4 are exempt from disclosure as "... emergency or security information or procedures for any buildings or facility which, if disclosed, would jeopardize security of the building or facility or persons therein." Where the Custodian has granted access to records responsive to the May 11, 2012 OPRA request item Nos. 1, 2 and 3 that he is unable to inspect, the Custodian should offer copies of the responsive records to the Complainant upon payment of applicable copying fees. However, the Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to these records as he granted inspection prior to the Complainant's departure from NJSP. The Custodian proved a lawful denial of access to the video images responsive to the May 11, 2012 OPRA request item Nos. 4, 5 and 6 under OPRA and the Department of Corrections' regulations. The Council should defer analysis of whether the Custodian knowingly and willfully violated OPRA and unreasonably denied access under the totality of the circumstances pending the Custodian's compliance with the Interim Order.

32. *Michael Vance v. County of Sussex, Sheriff's Office (2012-188)*

- The Complainant’s request is an invalid request for information that fails to seek identifiable government records. Thus, the Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the request.
33. Clevin A. Pittman v. Springfield Township Police Department (Union) (2012-196)
- Regarding OPRA request item Nos. 1 and 2, since the Custodian initially responded and further certified in the Statement of Information (SOI) that no records responsive to these OPRA request items exist, and because there is no evidence in the record to refute the Custodian’s certifications, the Custodian did not unlawfully deny access. Since the Custodian attached to the SOI records that may be responsive to OPRA request item No. 3, the Custodian failed to bear her burden of proving a lawful denial of access to those records. Thus, the Custodian must disclose these records to the Complainant and further disclose any other records that exist, if any. The Council should defer analysis of whether the Custodian knowingly and willfully violated OPRA and unreasonably denied access under the totality of the circumstances pending the Custodian’s compliance with the Interim Order.
34. Harry B. Scheeler, Jr. v. County of Atlantic (2012-197)
- The Custodian lawfully denied access to the requested 1,300 e-mail addresses because the Custodian proved that the disclosure of approximately 1,300 County e-mail addresses at once, in one document, constitutes administrative or technical information regarding computer hardware, software and networks which, if disclosed, would jeopardize computer security.” The Complainant is not a prevailing party entitled to an award of a reasonable attorney’s fee.
35. Michael Lamanteer v. County of Gloucester (2012-198)
- The Custodian’s request for reconsideration of the Council’s May 28, 2013 Interim Order should be granted. The Custodian has established that 1) the GRC’s decision is based upon a “palpably incorrect or irrational basis” and 2) it is obvious that the GRC did not consider the significance of probative, competent evidence; to wit, the GRC did not consider the Custodian’s SOI submission when rendering its decision. The Council rescinds paragraphs 1-4 of its Interim Order and finds that the Complainant’s cause of action was not ripe at the time of the filing of this Denial of Access Complaint; to wit, the Custodian provided a response to the OPRA request within the statutorily mandated seven (7) business days and properly sought a two-week extension of time to respond to said request. Further, the extension was reasonable based on the volume of the request and the fact that the records responsive were in storage. Also, the Council notes that the Custodian has already provided the requested records to the Complainant. Thus, this instant complaint is materially defective and should be dismissed.
36. Peter J. DeRobertis v. Township of Montclair (Essex) (2012-199)
- The Custodian failed to prove a lawful denial of access to the responsive invoices on the basis that the Township was not in possession of any records. The Custodian had an obligation to obtain and provide the responsive invoices to the Complainant. Thus, the Custodian should obtain and disclose the responsive invoices. The Council should defer analysis of whether the Custodian knowingly and willfully violated OPRA and unreasonably denied access under the totality of the circumstances pending the Custodian’s compliance with the Interim Order.
37. Stephen B. Levitt v. Township of Montclair (Essex) (2012-201)

- The Custodian did not prove that she timely responded to the OPRA request. As such, the Custodian’s failure to respond in writing to the OPRA request results in a “deemed” denial. However, the Council should decline to order disclosure of any records since the evidence of record shows that no records exist. Additionally, the evidence of record does not indicate that the Custodian’s violation of OPRA had a positive element of conscious wrongdoing or was intentional and deliberate. Therefore, the Custodian’s unlawful denial of access did not rise to the level of a knowing and willful violation of OPRA and unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances.

38. Walter A. Tormasi v. NJ Department of Corrections (2012-203)

39. Walter A. Tormasi v. NJ Department of Corrections (2012-204)

40. Walter A. Tormasi v. NJ Department of Corrections (2012-205) **Consolidated**

- Since the Custodian made the records responsive to the May 6, 2012 OPRA request No. 1, item No. 1, available upon payment of the appropriate copying costs, his response is appropriate. Moreover, the Custodian is not required to provide the requested records until receipt of payment of \$2.10. Thus, the Custodian lawfully denied access to the responsive records. Because OPRA does not require custodians to research files, correlate and compile data to create a record that may be responsive to an OPRA request, the Custodian had no legal duty to create a record containing the information which the Complainant specifically requested. Thus, the Custodian has proved that access to any responsive records was not unlawfully denied. Additionally, because the Custodian certified in the SOI that no records responsive to the request item existed, and because there is no credible evidence in the record to refute the Custodian’s certification, the Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to said records. The Custodian lawfully denied access to any records responsive to the May 6, 2012 OPRA request No. 1, item No. 3, because same do not fall within the excepted material allowed for disclosure under OPRA. Because the May 6, 2012 request No. 2 and May 18, 2012 request failed to identify the specific government records sought and would have forced the Custodian to research his records in order to locate any documents meeting the criterion set forth in said requests, the requests are overly broad and invalid under OPRA. Thus, the Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to any records.

41. Walter A. Tormasi v. NJ Department of Corrections (2012-206)

42. Walter A. Tormasi v. NJ Department of Corrections (2012-207) **Consolidated**

- The Custodian’s response to request item Nos. 2, 3 and 4, advising that he would not address same since access to the responsive record was previously granted, implicated the Council’s holding in Caggiano v. Borough of Stanhope (Sussex), GRC Complaint No. 2005-211 (January 2006). However, because the Custodian further advised that he would disclose the responsive record upon payment of the appropriate copy costs, the Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to said record because he is not required to disclose same until receipt of payment. The Custodian initially responded in writing advising that no records responsive to request item Nos. 6, 7 and 8 existed. The Custodian also certified in the SOI that the OPRA Liaison for NJSP could not locate any records, thus no records responsive exist. Moreover, since there is no credible evidence in the record to refute the Custodian’s certification, the Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to said records. Because request item No. 9 failed to identify the specific government records sought and would have forced the Custodian to research his records in order to locate any documents meeting the criterion set forth

in said requests, the request item is overly broad and invalid under OPRA. Thus, the Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to any records. The Custodian proved that the records responsive to the May 11, May 12 and May 13 OPRA requests (item Nos. 1 and 5) and the May 18, 2012 OPRA request, are exempt from disclosure as "... emergency or security information or procedures for any buildings or facility which, if disclosed, would jeopardize security of the building or facility or persons therein." The Council need not determine whether the other exemptions cited by the Custodian apply since the records are exempt under OPRA.

43. Misael Cordero v. NJ Department of Corrections (2012-209)

- The Custodian has proved that the release of the requested record would jeopardize the security of the New Jersey State Prison or the persons therein and that the record is exempt from public access. As such, the Custodian lawfully denied access to the requested record.

44. Brandon Melvin v. NJ Department of Law & Public Safety, NJ State Police (2012-212)

- The Custodian has complied with the terms of the Council's May 28, 2013 Interim Order because the Custodian disclosed the record responsive to request item number 1 and provided certified confirmation of same. Although the Custodian failed to prove that the Complainant withdrew his OPRA request before the Custodian responded to the request granting or denying access, the Custodian fully complied with the Council's May 28, 2013 Interim Order. Additionally, the evidence of record does not indicate that the Custodian's actions contained a positive element of conscious wrongdoing or were intentional and deliberate. Therefore, the Custodian's actions did not rise to the level of a knowing and willful violation of OPRA and unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances.

45. Robert C. Scutro v. City of Linden (Union) (2012-219)

- The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the requested police reports because at the time of the July 11, 2012 OPRA request, the Complainant was already in possession of the requested records, as confirmed by the Complainant in his Denial of Access Complaint. Thus, requiring the Custodian to duplicate another copy of the requested records and send them to the Complainant does not advance the purpose of OPRA, which is to ensure an informed citizenry.

46. Helen Arnold v. Morristown Housing Authority (Morris) (2012-220)

- The Custodian did not prove that she timely responded to the OPRA request. As such, the Custodian's failure to respond in writing to the OPRA request within the statutorily mandated seven (7) business days results in a "deemed" denial. Additionally, the Custodian violated OPRA by failing to provide immediate access to the requested budgets. The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to request item no. 4 because the Custodian made the records available for the Complainant's onsite review and subsequent copying upon payment of the per page copy fee.

47. Donna A. Fleming v. Town of Phillipsburg (Warren) (2012-222)

- The Custodian committed a “deemed” denial of the OPRA request because she failed to provide a written response within the extended time period. Notwithstanding the “deemed” denial, the Custodian has not unlawfully denied access to the records the Complainant asserts were withheld because the OPRA request is overly broad and invalid. As such, the Custodian’s actions did not rise to the level of a knowing and willful violation of OPRA and unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances.

48. Joyce Blay v. Ocean County Health Department (2012-223)

- The Custodian proved that she timely responded to the OPRA request because the Custodian responded in writing within the statutorily mandated seven (7) business days. The Custodian did not violate OPRA by failing to provide the Complainant with a copy of the OPRA request form dated July 18, 2012, because nothing in the evidence of record reveals the Complainant submitted an OPRA request for said request form and the Custodian is not otherwise obligated to provide a copy of the document. The Custodian did not unlawfully deny the Complainant access to the records responsive to request item number 1 because the Custodian properly informed the Complainant in a timely manner that said records were available for inspection, which was the Complainant’s preferred method of disclosure. The Custodian did not unlawfully deny the Complainant access to the records responsive to request item number 2 because the Complainant provided proof in her Denial of Access Complaint that copies of the requested records were in her possession at the time she filed the request for said records. Therefore, the Complainant could not have been denied access to the requested records because she already had in her possession at the time of the request the records she sought pursuant to OPRA. The Complainant’s request item number 3 is an invalid request that fails to seek identifiable government records.

49. Eugene Seabrooks v. County of Essex (2012-230)

- The Custodian failed to prove a lawful basis for a denial of access to the records responsive to request item number 1. As such, the Custodian must disclose the requested records to the Complainant. The records responsive to request item number 2 meet the criteria for criminal investigatory records; therefore, they are not government records as defined under OPRA and are not subject to public access. Thus, the Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to said records. The Council should defer analysis of whether the Custodian knowingly and willfully violated OPRA and unreasonably denied access under the totality of the circumstances pending the Custodian’s compliance with the Interim Order.

50. Jane Gasparik v. Township of Middletown (Monmouth) (2012-234)

- The GRC should conduct an *in camera* review of the e-mail sent by Anthony Mercantante to Richard DeBenedetto regarding “Jane – personnel” on July 10, 2012, at approximately 10:00 a.m., being the record identified by the Custodian as a single page e-mail from the Township Administrator to a department head, to determine the validity of the Custodian’s assertion that the record is exempt from disclosure because it is a personnel record and is also exempt from disclosure as ACD material. The Council should defer analysis of whether the Custodian knowingly and willfully violated OPRA and unreasonably denied access under the totality of the circumstances pending the Custodian’s compliance with the Council’s Interim Order.

51. Stephen Perry v. NJ Department of Corrections (2012-237)

- The Custodian properly denied the Complainant access to the four (4) Special Custody Reports because the Custodian certified that disclosure of said reports would compromise the safety and security of Northern State Prison and “emergency or security information or procedures for any buildings or facility which, if disclosed, would jeopardize security of the building or facility or persons therein” does not constitute a government record subject to disclosure. The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the requested video surveillance footage because the Custodian certified that no responsive record exists and the Complainant failed to submit any competent, credible evidence to refute the Custodian’s certification.

52. Michael S. Janowski v. NJ Department of Corrections (2012-240)

- The Custodian did not unlawfully deny the Complainant access to his medical records for the period of time which he was at the Steps Program. The Custodian properly concluded that the Complainant’s records request, related to “medical, psychiatric or psychological history, diagnosis, treatment or evaluation,” and thus were exempt from production pursuant to OPRA.

VIII. Court Decisions of GRC Complaints on Appeal: None

IX. Complaints Adjudicated in NJ Superior Court & NJ Supreme Court:

- Paff v. New Jersey State Firemen’s Association, 2013 N.J. Super. Lexis 90 (June 13, 2013).
- Paff v. Borough of Gibbsboro, 2013 N.J. Super. LEXIS 1468 (June 17, 2013).

X. Public Comment (Second Session):

- This second session of public comment is an opportunity to present suggestions, views and comments relevant to the Council’s functions and responsibilities. In the interest of time, speakers may be limited to **five (5) minutes**.

XI. Adjournment

***Neither attorneys nor other representatives of the parties are required to attend this meeting nor will they be permitted to make oral or written comment during the adjudication.**