



**Minutes of the Government Records Council  
September 21, 2006 Public Meeting – Open Session**

The meeting was called to order at 9:56 a.m. at the Department of Community Affairs, Conference Room 816, Trenton, New Jersey. The Open Public Meetings Act statement was read.

Ms. Hairston called the roll:

Present: Chairman Vincent Maltese, Secretary Robin Berg Tabakin, and Kathryn Forsyth.

GRC Staff: Executive Director Catherine Starghill, Brigitte Hairston, Jyothi, Tiffany Mayers, Colleen McGann, Designated Outside Counsel Barry Roy, and Deputy Attorney General Debra Allen.

Mr. Maltese read the Resolution for Closed Session (Resolution Number 2006-09-21) to conduct an *in camera* inspection and receive legal advice in the following complaint:

Narinder Gautam v. Department of Banking & Insurance (2006-49)

A motion was made by Ms. Tabakin seconded by Ms. Forsyth to go into closed session. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote. A motion was then made to re-open the open session so Mr. Maltese could read the Resolution as amended above at 9:45 am. Mr. Maltese read the Resolution. A motion was made to return to closed session by Ms. Tabakin and seconded by Ms. Forsyth. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote.

The Council met in closed session from 10:05 a.m. until 10:09 a.m.

Open Session reconvened at 10:22 a.m. and Ms. Hairston called the roll:

In attendance:

Mr. Maltese, Ms. Tabakin, and Ms. Forsyth. Ms. Richardson arrived at 11:00 am..

The pledge of allegiance was recited.

Mr. Maltese called for a motion to approve the open and closed session minutes of August 10, 2006 with amendments. A motion was made by Ms. Tabakin and seconded by Ms. Forsyth. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Maltese stated that he was recusing himself from the following complaints:

- Richard Rivera v. Township of West New York (2006-48)
- Narinder Gautam v. Department of Banking & Insurance (2006-49)

Ms. Tabakin informed the body that she was recusing herself from the following complaint:

- D.T. v. Rockaway Township Board of Education (2005-203)

Ms. Starghill informed the Council that the following complaint would not be heard today:

- Cathy Cardillo v. City of Hoboken, Zoning Office (2005-158)

**Council Adjudication:**

The following complaints were presented to the Council for summary administrative adjudication:

GRC Complaint Case and Number	Disposition
1. Vesselin Dittrich v. City of Hoboken (2005-97)	Complaint withdrawn
2. Steven Kossup v. Essex County Correctional Facility (2005-202)	Complaint withdrawn
3. Richard D. DeLa Roche v. Township of Mt. Olive (2006-58)	Settled in Mediation
4. Barbara Stoltz v. Cape May County Board of Health (2006-76)	No records responsive to the request
5. John Paff v. Kean University (2006-80)	Settled in Mediation
6. John Paff v. Township of Chester (2006-82)	Settled in Mediation
7. Joanne Ingemi v. Town of Hammonton (2006-87)	Settled in Mediation
8. Martin O'Shea v. Pooled Insurance Program of NJ (2006-89)	Settled in Mediation
9. A.J. Nash v. Passaic, Superintendent of Schools (2006-97)	No records responsive to the request
10. John Paff v. Union Township Board of Education (2006-104)	Settled in Mediation
11. A.J. Nash v. State of NJ , Department of Law & Public Safety, Division of Consumer Affairs (2006-114)	Not a valid OPRA request
12. Paula Baldwin v. Township of Readington (2006-115)	Settled in Mediation
13. Luis M. Perez v. Borough of Glassboro (2006-117)	Complaint withdrawn
14. Ann Bernice Segal v. Moorestown Public Schools (2006-120)	Settled in Mediation

15. Joseph Tetelman v. NJ State Police (2006-129)	Complaint withdrawn
16. John Paff v. Borough of Hampton (2006-134)	Settled in Mediation
17. Thomas Caggiano v. NJ Government Records Council (2006-142)	Complaint withdrawn
18. Joe Truland v. Engishtown Borough Police Department (2006- 146)	Complaint withdrawn

Mr. Maltese called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's recommendations as written in all of the above Administrative Case Dispositions. A motion was made by Ms. Tabakin and seconded by Ms. Forsyth. The motion passed unanimously.

The following complaints were presented to the Council for individual adjudication:

**Amelia Spaulding v. County of Passaic**

Ms. Starghill reviewed the GRC's analysis and issues in the case as set forth in the Supplemental Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director. Ms. Starghill presented the following recommendations to the Council:

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that the parties have complied with the Council's July 13, 2006 Interim Order. Specifically, the Complainant e-mailed a jointed certification signed by both parties that indicates:

- (1) the parties have met and mutually agreed on the cost issue (negating the need to refer the complaint to the Office of Administrative Law),
- (2) the parties have mutually agreed on an arrangement for the copying of filing books,
- (3) the parties have mutually agreed on a resolution concerning attorneys' fees (negating Complainant Counsel's need to submit an application for same to the GRC), and
- (4) the parties agreed on all other matters in dispute.

Mr. Maltese called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's supplemental findings and recommendations as written. A motion was made by Ms. Forsyth and seconded by Ms. Tabakin. The motion passed unanimously.

**Cynthia McBride v. Township of Hamilton (2005-86)**

Ms. Starghill reviewed the GRC's analysis and issues in the case as set forth in the Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director. Ms. Starghill presented the recommendations to the Council which were amended as follows:

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that:

1. The denial of access on the ninth business day after receiving the request is a violation of OPRA. Therefore, the Custodian has unlawfully denied access to the requested records in electronic format pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.i.
2. Since the Custodian has admitted to maintaining the requested record in the medium requested, it is clear that the Custodian is required to provide a copy of the requested record in such medium pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.d. As such, the Custodian has violated OPRA by refusing to give the Complainant the requested electronic file copy which the Custodian does maintain pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.d. The Custodian's offer of providing the Complainant the requested records in paper format in lieu of the requested electronic file maintained by the Custodian is not acceptable under OPRA.
3. The Custodian's assertion that exempt information must be redacted is correct however the Custodian unlawfully denied access to the requested records when those records were not made available to the Complainant with the appropriate redactions pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.g.
4. If there is any information in the requested records requiring redaction due to the exemption from disclosure for advisory, consultative or deliberative material pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1., then such redactions should be made before providing the records to the Complainant. The Custodian should make the redactions in accordance with the legal standard set forth in OPRA and by the Courts.

**The Custodian shall disclose such records within a reasonable time given the volume of the records requested not to exceed twenty (20) business days from receipt of the Council's Interim Order and simultaneously provide certified confirmation of such disclosure to the Executive Director. [This Order will become effective after the GRC approves the special service charge assessed by the Custodian in #6 below.]**

5. The Custodian's assertions that disclosing the requested record in electronic format results in discriminatory information sharing in violation of a formal opinion written by the New Jersey Tax Collectors Association and that the value of the records to the Complainant (in terms of the revenue the Complainant may receive by selling the records to its commercial customers) requires the Custodian to auction the records to the highest bidder to ensure that the municipality receives fair compensation for its assets pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40A:11-36 are misplaced in reference to the Custodian's legal obligations under OPRA.
6. Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.c. and Courier Post v. Lenape Regional High School District, 360 N.J. Super. 191, 204 (Law Div. 2002), the Custodian must borne the burden of proving that a special service charge is warranted in this case. However, the special service charge should only reflect the hours spent reviewing the records for exempt information and the hourly rate (minus the fringe benefits) of appropriate personnel utilized.

**The Custodian shall within ten (15) business days from receipt of the Council's Interim Order:**

- (a) provide the GRC with the amount of the special service charge assessed and answers to the fourteen (14) questions the GRC uses to evaluate a special service charge as established in Janon Fisher v. Division of Law & Public Safety, GRC Complaint No. 2004-55 (December 2004);**
  - (b) offer the Complainant the opportunity to review and object to the charge prior to it being incurred pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.c.; and**
  - (c) release the requested records with the appropriate redactions made if the Complainant agrees to the special service charge assessed.**
7. The Custodian should provide the requested electronic file to the Complainant for the cost it originally determined as the duplication fee for the requested electronic record.
- Please note that this cost is separate from the reasonable special service charge that may be charged by the Custodian for the extraordinary time and effort that may be determined as warranted for the review of the records contained in the electronic file to ensure that redactions are made for information exemption from disclosure as advisory, consultative or deliberative material pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1.
8. Given the contested facts regarding this issue, it is possible that the Custodian's actions were intentional and deliberate, with knowledge of their wrongfulness, and not merely negligent, heedless or unintentional. As such, the case should be referred to the Office of Administrative Law for determination of a knowing and willful violation of the Act under the totality of the circumstances.
9. The Complainant's Counsel is required to submit to the GRC a written application for attorney's fees supported by an attorney affidavit of service pursuant to New Jersey Court Rule 4:42-9(b). The Complainant shall so comply within ten (10) business days from receipt of the Council's Interim Order and simultaneously provide certified confirmation of compliance to the Executive Director. The GRC reserves the right to make the determination on the issue of prevailing party attorney's fees after all other issues are resolved.

Mr. Maltese called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as amended. A motion was made by Ms. Tabakin and seconded by Ms. Forsyth. The motion passed unanimously.

**David Herron v. Montclair Community Pre-k (2005-130)**

Ms. Starghill reviewed the GRC's analysis and issues in the case as set forth in the Supplemental Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director. Ms. Starghill presented the following recommendations to the Council:

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that the Custodian has complied with the Council's August 10, 2006 Interim Order.

Mr. Maltese called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's supplemental findings and recommendations as written. A motion was made by Ms. Forsyth and seconded by Ms. Tabakin. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **D.T. v. Rockaway Township Board of Education 2005-203**

Ms. Starghill reviewed the GRC's analysis and issues in the case as set forth in the Supplemental Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director. Ms. Starghill presented the following recommendations to the Council:

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that this complaint is no longer ripe for adjudication since the Complainant voluntarily withdrew the complaint pursuant to a letter to the Council dated August 18, 2006.

Mr. Maltese called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's supplemental findings and recommendations. A motion was made by Ms. Michelle Richardson and seconded by Ms. Forsyth. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **Jane Cowley v. Township of Kinwood (2006-45)**

Ms. Starghill reviewed the GRC's analysis and issues in the case as set forth in the Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director. Ms. Starghill presented the recommendations to the Council which were amended as follows:

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that:

1. The unapproved draft meeting minutes and the Custodian's handwritten notes of the Township Committee meetings constitute inter-agency, intra-agency advisory, consultative, or deliberative material and are exempt from disclosure pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1, as well as O'Shea v. West Milford Board of Education, GRC Case No. 2004-93 (April, 2006). As such, the Custodian has born her burden of proving a lawful denial of access pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6 as she certifies that the requested minutes which have not already been provided have not yet been approved by the governing body.
2. However, the Custodian has unlawfully denied access to the audio tapes of the Township Committee meetings because these tapes do not constitute inter-agency or intra-agency advisory, consultative, or deliberative material. The audio tapes are not pre-decisional as they are the recording of the actual statements made by the attendees of the meetings. These tapes may require redaction of information discussed which is otherwise exempt from disclosure to the public under OPRA, but in general the inter-agency or intra-agency advisory, consultative, or deliberative material exemption does not apply. As such, the audio tapes (if any exist)

should be released to the Complainant with any redactions which may be lawfully justified pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6.

3. Since the Custodian certifies granting the Complainant access to the requested records within the statutorily mandated time frame pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.i. by allowing the Complainant to view the records during regular business hours pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.a. and the Complainant's request to inspect the requested records, the Custodian has properly responded to the Complainant's request and has not unlawfully denied access to the requested records.
4. **The Custodian shall comply with "2." above within five (5) business days from receipt of this Interim Order and simultaneously provide certified confirmation of compliance to the Executive Director.**

Mr. Maltese called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as amended. A motion was made by Ms. Forsyth and seconded by Ms. Richardson. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **Richard Rivera v. Township of West New York (2006-48)**

Ms. McGann reviewed the GRC's analysis and issues in the case as set forth in the Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director. Ms. McGann presented the following recommendations to the Council:

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that:

1. The Custodian has passed on the actual cost for production of the requested check registries on a CD-ROM in Excel spread sheet format to the Complainant pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.d., and in accordance with the GRC decision in Burns v. Borough of Collingswood, GRC Case No. 2004-217 (April 2005). Therefore, the Custodian has properly charged the Complainant for the requested check registries on a CD-ROM in Excel spread sheet format.
2. While the Custodian's argument regarding the timeliness of this complaint is compelling, the GRC proposed rules, *N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.2* have not yet been adopted and there is no statute of limitation on the filing of a denial of access complaint.

Ms. Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. A motion was made by Ms. Richardson and seconded by Ms. Forsyth. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **Narinder Gautam v. NJ Department of Banking & Insurance (2006-49)**

Ms. Starghill reviewed the GRC's analysis and issues in the case as set forth in the *In Camera* Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director. Ms. Starghill presented the recommendations to the Council which were amended as follows:

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that the second (2<sup>nd</sup>) paragraph on page one (1) of the in the Complainant's psychiatric report, except for the first and last sentences, is exempt from disclosure pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1, (a public

agency's responsibility and obligation to safeguard a citizen's right to privacy), as well as Wilcox v. Township of West Caldwell, GRC Complaint No. 2004-28, (October 2004) and Perino v. Borough of Haddon Heights, GRC Complaint No. 2004-128, (November 2004).

**The Custodian shall disclose the first and last sentences of the Complainant's psychiatric report within ten (5) business days from receipt of this Interim Order and simultaneously provide certified confirmation of compliance to the Executive Director of the Government Records Council.**

Mr. Maltese called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's *in camera* findings and recommendations as written. A motion was made by Ms. Tabakin and seconded by Ms. Forsyth. The motion passed unanimously.

**Vesselin Dittrich v. NJ Department of Community Affairs, Division of Codes & Standards (Bureau of Homeowner Protection) (2006-50)**

Ms. McGann reviewed the GRC's analysis and issues in the case as set forth in the Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director. Ms. McGann presented the following recommendations to the Council:

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find:

1. Based on the legal standard set forth by the Courts and the certified statements of the Custodian, the Custodian properly denied access to the requested e-mail as it is advisory, consultative and deliberative in content and therefore, not a government record pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1.
2. The Custodian's failure to provide to the Complainant a lawful basis for a denial of access to the e-mail within the statutorily mandated seven (7) business days resulted in a "deemed" denial pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.i.
3. The Custodian's failure to provide a written response indicating a lawful denial to the e-mail at issue is a violation of N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.g.

Mr. Maltese called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. A motion was made by Ms. Richardson and seconded by Ms. Tabakin. The motion passed unanimously.

**Norman Berger v. Kean University (2006-56)**

Ms. Starghill reviewed the GRC's analysis and issues in the case as set forth in the Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director. Ms. Starghill presented the recommendations to the Council which were amended as follows:

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find:

1. Additional information is required as follows:
  - (a) Were RPFs issued for the construction of a road through the Liberty Hall Museum property located at 103 Morris Avenue, Union, NJ 07083?



- (b) Were contracts entered for the same stated in (a) above? If so, please provide the contracts to the Council for review.
  - (c) What entity/organization is paying for the construction of same stated in (a) above (Kean University or some other organization)?
  - (d) Whose property is the road in question being constructed through (Kean University or Liberty Hall Museum) or is this property jointly owned and if so, by whom?
2. While the Custodian has provided facts in support of the legal conclusions asserted in support of withholding the records the Custodian asserts are exempt from disclosure, the Council must determine whether the legal conclusions asserted by the Custodian (that the information which, if disclosed, would give an advantage to competitors or bidders as well as whether the documents include inter-agency or intra-agency advisory, consultative, or deliberative material) are properly applied to the records withheld from the Complainant. Therefore, based on Council decisions in Boggia v. Borough of Oakland, GRC Case No. 2005-36 (April, 2006) and Burns v. Borough of Collingswood, GRC Case No. 2004-169 (September 2005), the Council must conduct an *in camera* inspection of the records the Custodian deems is exempt from disclosure.
  3. Pursuant to Glenn v. NJ Department of Community Affairs, Division of Housing GRC Case No. 2005-47 (April, 2006) as well as the fact that the Custodian certified that she didn't receive a proper OPRA request until February 22, 2006 (the first correspondence came via letter on February 14, 2006 to which the Custodian responded by faxing the Complainant the proper OPRA request form) and consequently responded that same day, she is not in violation of N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.i. or N.J.S.A. 5.g.
  4. Pursuant to the fact that the Custodian seemingly did research to find any and all records that might have been responsive to the OPRA request (and gave a thorough albeit inconclusive response to the records that are being denied), as well as the fact that the Custodian responded to the Complainant within the statutorily required seven (7) business days required by OPRA, there is no evidence that the Custodian's actions were consistent with the legal standards established for knowing and willful conduct by the New Jersey courts. Therefore, the Custodian's actions do not rise to the level of a knowing and willful violation of OPRA and unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-11.a.
  5. **The Custodian shall comply with "1." And "2." above within five (5) business days from receipt of this Interim Order and simultaneously provide certified confirmation of compliance to the Executive Director.**

Mr. Maltese called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as amended. A motion was made by Ms. Tabakin and seconded by Ms. Richardson. The motion passed unanimously.

### **Richard Kasper v. Washington Township School Board (2006-57)**

Ms. Starghill reviewed the GRC's analysis and issues in the case as set forth in the Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director. Ms. Starghill presented the following recommendations to the Council:

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find:

1. A record (the contract requested) should have been provided to the Complainant *immediately* pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.e., unless such record was not immediately available because it was in storage or archived. The Custodian never asserted that the requested contract was in storage or archived. Therefore, the Custodian unlawfully denied immediate access to the RFP or contract used to secure telephone equipment in the high school and the middle school verbally over the telephone pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.e.
2. Although both the Complainant and the Custodian agree that they engaged in verbal communication regarding the Complainant's OPRA request within the statutorily mandated seven (7) business day time frame, the Custodian's failure to provide a written response to said request is a violation of N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.g.
3. While the Custodian provided facts that support the legal basis for the denial of access to the construction reports (that the information, which, if disclosed, would give an advantage to competitors or bidders), the Council should conduct an *in camera* review of the requested 39 page document prepared by Bovis Lend Lease, Inc. to determine if said report, or portions therein are exempt from disclosure pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1 and Boggia v. Borough of Oakland, GRC Complaint No. 2005-36 (April 2006).
4. While the Custodian's actions were negligent, heedless or unintentional, the Custodian has not knowingly and willfully violated OPRA and unreasonably denied access under the totality of the circumstances pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-11.a. and the legal standard established for same by New Jersey Courts.
5. The Custodian must deliver to the Council in a sealed envelop six copies of the requested unredacted document (see #3 above), a document or redaction index detailing the document and/or each redaction you assert and the Custodian's legal certification under penalty of perjury that the document provided is the document requested by the Council for the *in camera* no later than *five (5) business days from the distribution date of the Council's Interim Order.*

Mr. Maltese called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. A motion was made by Ms. Richardson and seconded by Ms. Tabakin. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **Steven Siebenlist v. NJ Department of Health and Senior Services (2006-81)**

Ms. Starghill reviewed the GRC's analysis and issues in the case as set forth in the Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director. Ms. Starghill presented the following recommendations to the Council:

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find:

1. Based on Caggiano v. Borough of Stanhope, GRC Case No. 2005-211 et seq.<sup>1</sup> (January, 2006), the Custodian is in violation of N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1 for not providing the Complainant with documents the Custodian states are

---

<sup>1</sup> Caggiano v. Borough of Stanhope, GRC Case No. 2005-211, 2005-226, 2005-227, 2005-228, 2005-229, 2005-230, 2005-231, 2005-232, 2005-233, 2005-234, 2005-235, 2005-250, 2005-252 (January, 2006.)

already in the Complainant's possession as well as stating that certain documents were e-mailed to the Complainant prior to the date of the request. Therefore, the Custodian should release the documents responsive to the Complainant's request, with proper redactions pursuant to OPRA that the Custodian claims are already in the Complainant's possession.

2. The Custodian is in violation of N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6 for not bearing her burden of proving that the redacted information in the surveyor's notes is authorized by law. Based on the above, the Council should conduct an *in camera* inspection of the surveyor's notes to determine if the records are exempt from disclosure.
3. Pursuant to Paff v. Borough of Somerville, GRC Case No. 2005-55 (November 2005) as well as the fact that the Complainant's OPRA request was received on March 31, 2006 and was not responded to until April 26, 2006 the Custodian is in violation of N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.i. as well as N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.g.
4. While the Custodian did not respond to the Complainant's OPRA request within the statutorily mandated seven (7) business days, denied access to portions of the surveyor's notes without providing a sufficient legal basis for doing same, and denied access to records the Custodian previously provided to the Complainant in violation of OPRA pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1 and Caggiano v. Borough of Stanhope, GRC Case No. 2005-211 et seq.<sup>2</sup> (January, 2006), the Custodian's actions do not rise to the level of a knowing and willful violation of OPRA and unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-11.a. and the legal standard for same established by the New Jersey Courts.
5. The Custodian must deliver to the Council in a sealed envelop six copies of the requested unredacted document (see #2 above), a document or redaction index detailing the document and/or each redaction you assert and the Custodian's legal certification under penalty of perjury that the document provided is the document requested by the Council for the *in camera* no later than **five (5) business days from the distribution date of the Council's Interim Order.**

Mr. Maltese called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. A motion was made by Ms. Forsyth and seconded by Ms. Richardson. The motion passed unanimously.

### **Executive Directors Report:**

Ms. Starghill introduced everyone to the two (2) new GRC staff members: Jyothi Pamidimukkala (Resource Manager) and Tiffany Mayer (Case Manager). Ms. Starghill also announced the resignation of Chris Malloy (Case Manager).

### **Public Comment:**

---

<sup>2</sup> Caggiano v. Borough of Stanhope, GRC Case No. 2005-211, 2005-226, 2005-227, 2005-228, 2005-229, 2005-230, 2005-231, 2005-232, 2005-233, 2005-234, 2005-235, 2005-250, 2005-252 (January, 2006.)

Beth Mason: President of the NJ Foundation for Open Government made comments.

Meeting adjourned at 11:46 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Robin Berg Tabakin, Secretary

Dated Approved: