



Minutes of the Government Records Council August 29, 2023 Public Meeting – Open Session

I. Public Session:

- **Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 1:34 p.m. by Ms. Robin Berg Tabakin via Microsoft Teams.

- **Pledge of Allegiance**

All stood and recited the pledge of allegiance in salute to the American flag.

- **Meeting Notice**

Ms. Berg Tabakin read the following Open Public Meetings Act statement:

“This meeting was called pursuant to the provisions of the Open Public Meeting Act. Notices of this meeting were faxed to the Newark Star Ledger, Trenton Times, Courier-Post (Cherry Hill), and the Secretary of State on August 24, 2023.

- **Roll Call**

Ms. Bordzoe called the roll:

Present: Robin Berg Tabakin, Esq. (Chairwoman), Jennifer Simons, Esq. (designee of Department of Education Acting Commissioner Dr. Angelica Allen-McMillan), and John Alexy (designee of Department of Community Affairs Acting Commissioner, Kimberly K. Holmes).

Absent: Steven Ritardi, Esq., Public Member.

GRC Staff in Attendance: Frank F. Caruso (Executive Director), Rosemond Bordzoe (Secretary), John Stewart (Mediator), Samuel Rosado (Staff Attorney), and Deputy Attorney General Steven Gleeson.

II. Executive Director’s Report:

Current Statistics

- Since OPRA’s inception in July 2002, the GRC has received 6,839 Denial of Access Complaints. That averages about 326 annual complaints over a little more than 21

tracked program years. So far in the current program year (FY2023), the GRC has received 54 Denial of Access Complaints.

- 600 of the 6,839 complaints remain open and active (8.8%). Of those open cases:
 - 13 complaints are on appeal with the Appellate Division (2.2%);
 - 34 complaints are currently in mediation (5.7%);
 - 3 complaints are proposed for the Office of Administrative Law (0.5%);
 - 26 complaints await adjudication by the Office of Administrative Law (4.3%);
 - 46 complaints are tentatively scheduled for adjudication at an upcoming GRC meeting, which includes the current meeting (7.6%);
 - 478 complaints are work in progress (80.0%); and
 - 0 complaints are being held in abeyance (0.0%).

- Since Program Year 2004, the GRC has received and responded to 37,707 total inquiries, averaging about 1,885 annual inquiries per a little more than 20 tracked program years (the GRC did not track inquiries in the agency's first year). So far in the current program year (FY2023), the GRC has received 276 inquiries (6.9 inquiries per workday).

GRC Regulations

- As the Council knows, the GRC has continued to monitor its process considering significant changes to the regulations in November 2022. During this continued monitoring, the following changes are being made effective after today's meeting.
 - Last month, it was reported that the GRC was considering changes to its interim order ("IO") and final decision ("FD") compliance time frames. After additional discussion, the GRC has decided to increase IO compliance time frames from five (5) business days to ten (10) business days and FD compliance time frames from ten (10) business days to twenty (20) business days. The increase in IO time frame will ensure consistency with the recently created Administrative Order time frame and also mirrors the regulatory "Request for Reconsideration" time frame. The increase in the FD compliance time frame is mindful of the potential that FDs may result in an order to disclose many records, address numerous redactions, *etc.* and also brings the time frame more in line with a typical court order requiring compliance.
 - More recently, the GRC has been received several complaints filed beyond the sixty (60) calendar day statute of limitation. N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.1(a). The regulation itself does not have a clear process for addressing this issue. After further discussion, the GRC has decided on the following procedure:

- Complaints filed out of time and absent a motion to file within time, showing good cause, will be returned to the filer with proper notification of N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.1(a).
- Complaints filed out of time including a motion to file within time will be addressed as follows:
 - Where the motion is being granted, parties will be notified by Administrative Order of the Council.
 - Where the motion is being denied, parties will be notified by Administrative Disposition.

GRC Upcoming Meeting Reminder

- For the benefit of both the Council and the public, the GRC reminds everyone that the September 2023 meeting, which was set to be held on September 26, 2023, has been rescheduled to October 3, 2023. This change was memorialized in the December 2022 meeting minutes as part of the Council's final review and vote on 2023 meeting dates.

GRC Outreaches

- The next outreach will be on September 14, 2023 and is hosted by Assemblywoman Aura Dunn (LD25) in Chester, NJ.

III. Closed Session: None

IV. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings:

July 25, 2023 Open Session Meeting Minutes

Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to approve the draft open session minutes of the July 25, 2023 meeting. Ms. Simons noted that he confirmed the accuracy of the minutes with Mr. Michael Hahn. Mr. Alexy made a motion, which was seconded by Ms. Simons. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

V. New Business – Cases Scheduled for Adjudication

Ms. Berg Tabakin stated that 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 reason for the Administrative Disposition is under each complaint below:

A. Administrative Disposition Adjudications with Recusals (Consent Agenda):

1. **Shinea Jones v. Newark Police Department (Essex) (2023-153) (SR Recusal)**
 - No Records Responsive to the Request Exist.
 - Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the recommendations as written in the above Administrative Complaint Disposition. Mr. Alexy made a motion, which was seconded by Ms. Simons. The motion passed by a unanimous vote; Mr. Ritardi was absent.

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

1. **Klarida Papajani v. Saddle Brook Board of Education (Bergen) (2023-117)**
 - No Records Responsive to the Request Exist.
2. **Klarida Papajani v. Saddle Brook Police Department (Bergen) (2023-122)**
 - No Records Responsive to the Request Exist.
3. **Mildred F. Waale v. Warren Township Planning Board (Somerset) (2023-166)**
 - Motion to File Within Time Denied.
4. **Walter Marsico v. Vernon Township (Sussex) (2023-171)**
 - All Records Responsive Provided in a Timely Manner.

Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the recommendations as written in all the above Administrative Complaint Dispositions. Mr. Alexy made a motion, which was seconded by Ms. Simons. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

C. Administrative Disposition of Uncontested, Voluntary Withdrawals by Complainant (No Adjudication of the Council is Required):

1. **Young America's Foundation v. Rutgers University (2022-277)**
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
2. **Vincent Conti v. NJ Civil Service Commission (2022-589 et al) (See Appendix A)**
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
3. **Tracy Soman v. Deerfield Township (Cumberland) (2023-38)**
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
4. **Romeo Murano v. City of Newark (Essex) (2023-124)**
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
5. **Alexandria "Alix" Hayes v. Township of Ocean School District (Monmouth) (2023-126)**
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
6. **Rachael Tennant v. City of Orange Township (Essex) (2023-132)**
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
7. **John Paff v. Piscataway Fire District No. 3 (Middlesex) (2023-140)**
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
8. **Maureen Woerner v. Lebanon Township School District (Hunterdon) (2023-147)**
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.

9. **Derek Timms v. City of Ventnor City (Atlantic) (2023-172)**
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
10. **Sandeep Chellani v. Township of Weehawken (Hudson) (2023-185)**
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.

VI. New Business – Cases Scheduled for Consent Agenda Administrative Order

An “Administrative order” means an order issued by the Council requiring the records custodian or the complainant to perform a specific action in furtherance of the adjudication of a pending denial of access complaint or taking other actions deemed appropriate to adjudicate a complaint in an expedited manner. The Executive Director’s recommended reason for the Administrative Order is under each complaint below.

A. Administrative Orders with Recusals (Consent Agenda): None

B. Administrative Orders with No Recusals (Consent Agenda): None

VII. New Business – Cases Scheduled for Individual Complaint Adjudication

A. Individual Complaint Adjudications with Recusals:

1. **David Weiner v. County of Essex (2022-185) (SR Recusal)**
 - The Custodian’s failure to timely respond resulted in a “deemed” denial of access. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g); N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i). However, the GRC declines to order disclosure because the Custodian responded on July 12, 2022 stating that no additional records existed.
 - Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote; Mr. Ritardi was absent.

A brief summary of the Executive Director’s recommended action is under each complaint:

B. Individual Complaint Adjudications with no Recusals:

1. **MN and EN (o/b/o AN) v. Gloucester Township Board of Education (Camden) (2020-124)**
 - The Council should determine the reasonable fee amount to which the Complainant’s Counsel is entitled.
 - The Council should find that Complainant’s Counsel is entitled to an adjusted fee award of \$9,400.00 representing 18.2 hours of service at \$500.00 per hour and 1.5 hours at \$200.00 per hour.
 - No fee enhancement should be awarded because Complainant’s Counsel failed to demonstrate that the complaint warrants same.

- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

2. **Kenneth S. Goodkind v. NJ Civil Service Commission (2021-84)**

- The Custodian did not fully comply with the Council’s June 28, 2022 Interim Order.
- This complaint should be referred to the Office of Administrative Law (“OAL”) based on contested facts. N.J.A.C. 1:1-3.2(a). The fact-finding hearing should include a clarification of the factual record, a full accounting of all responsive records to both OPRA requests, an *in camera* review, and additional actions the OAL deems necessary. For efficacy purposes, the OAL should also determine whether the Custodian knowingly and willfully violated OPRA.
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

3. **Andrew Garcia Phillips v. City of Rahway (Union) (2023-236)**

- The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the requested survey data because he failed to prove that same was in draft form and thus exempt under the “inter-agency, or intra-agency advisory, consultative, or deliberative material” exemption. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1; N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Libertarians for Transparent Gov’t v. Gov’t Records Council, 453 N.J. Super. 83 (App. Div. 2018). However, the GRC declines to order disclosure because the Custodian did so on October 25, 2021.
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

4. **Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (o/b/o African American Data & Research Institute) v. North Arlington Borough Police Department (Bergen) (2021-273)**

- The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the OPRA request seeking specific personnel information. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10; Danis v. Garfield Bd. of Educ. (Bergen), GRC Complaint No. 2009-156, *et seq.* (Interim Order dated April 28, 2010). The Custodian shall either locate and disclose the requested personnel information or certify if no records exist.
- The Custodian’s response to the portion of the request seeking settlements was consistent with prevailing case law and the Council’s prior decisions. Libertarians for Transparent Gov’t v. Cumberland Cnty., 465 N.J. Super. 11 (App. Div. 2020). Thus, the Council should decline to find that an unlawful

denial of access occurred. Moore v. N.J. Dep't of Corr., GRC Complaint No. 2009-144 (Interim Order dated October 26, 2010).

- The prevailing party analysis is deferred.
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

5. **Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (o/b/o African American Data & Research Institute) v. Harrington Park Police Department (Bergen) (2021-274)**

- The Custodian's insufficient search resulted in an unlawful denial of access to responsive agreements. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Weiner v. Cnty. of Essex, GRC Complaint No. 2013-52 (September 2013). However, the GRC declines to order disclosure because the Custodian did so on December 6, 2021.
- The Complainant is a prevailing party. The parties shall confer on fees and advise the GRC within twenty (20) business days if an agreement is reached. If not, Complainant's Counsel shall submit a fee application in accordance with N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.13.
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

6. **Fred Thomas v. County of Burlington (2021-275)**

- The Custodian lawfully denied access to the requested body-worn camera and other footage from the inside of a jail based on the security and surveillance exemption. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1; N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Gilleran v. Twp. of Bloomfield, 227 N.J. 159 (2016).
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

7. **Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (o/b/o African American Data & Research Institute) v. Bergenfield Police Department (Bergen) (2021-280)**

- The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to records responsive to the Complainant's OPRA request because all were provided. Danis, GRC 2009-156, *et seq.*
- The Complainant is not a prevailing party.
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as

written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

8. **Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (o/b/o African American Data & Research Institute) v. Fort Lee Police Department (Bergen) (2021-281)**

- The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the OPRA request seeking specific personnel information. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10; Danis, GRC 2009-156, *et seq.* The Custodian shall either locate and disclose the requested personnel information or certify if no records exist.
- The Custodian's response to the portion of the request seeking settlements was consistent with prevailing case law and the Council's prior decisions. Libertarians, 465 N.J. Super. 11. Thus, the Council should decline to find that an unlawful denial of access occurred. Moore, GRC 2009-144.
- The prevailing party analysis is deferred.
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

9. **Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (o/b/o African American Data & Research Institute) v. Clementon Borough Police Department (Camden) (2021-282)**

- The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to records responsive to the Complainant's OPRA request because all were provided. Danis, GRC 2009-156, *et seq.*
- The Complainant is not a prevailing party.
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Simons made a motion and Mr. Alexy seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

10. **Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (o/b/o African American Data & Research Institute) v. Berkeley Heights Police Department (Union) (2021-284)**

- The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to records responsive to the Complainant's OPRA request because all were provided. Danis, GRC 2009-156, *et seq.*
- The Complainant is not a prevailing party.
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Simons made a motion and Mr. Alexy seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

11. **Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (o/b/o African American Data & Research Institute) v. Green Brook Police Department (Somerset) (2021-286)**

- The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to records responsive to the Complainant's OPRA request because all were provided. Danis, GRC 2009-156, *et seq.*
- The Complainant is not a prevailing party.
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Simons made a motion and Mr. Alexy seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

12. **Ronald Brown v. East Brunswick Police Department (Middlesex) (2021-290)**

- The Custodian's response was insufficient because she failed to address each OPRA request item individually. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g); Paff v. Willingboro Bd. of Educ. (Burlington), GRC Complaint No. 2007-272 (May 2008).
- The Complainant's OPRA request is invalid because it failed to identify a specific government record and required research. MAG Entm't, LLC v. Div. of ABC, 375 N.J. Super. 534 (App. Div. 2005); Lagerkvist v. Office of the Governor, 443 N.J. Super. 230 (App. Div. 2015).
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Simons made a motion and Mr. Alexy seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

13. **Ronald Brown v. East Brunswick Police Department (Middlesex) (2021-291)**

- The Complainant's request item Nos. 1 through 7 are invalid because they failed to identify a specific government record and required research. MAG, 375 N.J. Super. 534; Lagerkvist, 443 N.J. Super. 230. Further request item No. 2 is outside of the Council's jurisdiction. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-7(g).
- The Complainant's request item No. 8 is invalid because it failed to identify a specific government record and required research. MAG, 375 N.J. Super. 534; Taylor v. Elizabeth Bd. of Educ. (Union), GRC Complaint No. 2007-214 (April 2008).
- The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to OPRA request item No. 9 because the Complainant sought a record he confirmed was in his possession. Bart v. City of Paterson Hous. Auth., 403 N.J. Super. 609 (App. Div. 2008).
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Simons made a motion and Mr. Alexy seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

14. **Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (o/b/o African American Data & Research Institute) v. Elk Township Police Department (Gloucester) (2021-292)**

- The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to records responsive to the Complainant's OPRA request because all were provided. Danis, GRC 2009-156, *et seq.*
- The Complainant is not a prevailing party.
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Simons made a motion and Mr. Alexy seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

15. **Ronald Brown v. East Brunswick Police Department (Middlesex) (2021-314)**

- The Complainant's request item No. 1 is invalid because it did not contain the requisite criteria, and specifically the content and/or subject, to be considered valid. Elcavage v. West Milford Twp. (Passaic), GRC Complaint No. 2009-07 (April 2010).
- The Custodian lawfully denied access to the Complainant's OPRA request item No. 3, which sought internal affairs records. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; N.J.S.A. 47:1A-9(a); Rivera v. Union Cnty. Prosecutor's Office, 250 N.J. Super. 124 (2022).
- The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to records responsive to the Complainant's OPRA request item Nos. 2 and 4 because all were provided. Danis, GRC 2009-156, *et seq.*
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Simons made a motion and Mr. Alexy seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

16. **Michael Gardenier v. Borough of Cliffside Park (Bergen) (2022-171)**

- The Complainant's request item Nos. 1, 3, and 5 are invalid because they sought generic "documents." MAG, 375 N.J. Super. 534; Carter v. N.J. Dep't of Cmty. Affairs, Div. of Local Gov't Servs., 2019 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 2510 (App. Div. 2019); Feiler-Jampel v. Somerset Cnty. Prosecutor's Office, GRC Complaint No. 2007-190 (Interim Order dated March 26, 2008). The Complainant's request item No. 2 is invalid because it sought information. LaMantia v. Jamesburg Pub. Library (Middlesex), GRC Complaint No. 2008-140 (February 2009). Finally, the Complainant's request item No. 4 (and by extension item No. 6) is invalid because it did not contain the requisite criteria, and specifically the date or range or range of dates and the content and/or subject, to be considered valid. Elcavage, GRC 2009-07.
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Simons made a motion and Mr. Alexy seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

17. **Anonymous v. Englishtown Police Department (Monmouth) (2022-439)**

- Custodian Counsel’s request for reconsideration should be denied. Thus, the July 25, 2023 Interim Order remains in effect and the Custodian shall comply accordingly.
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Caruso noted that footnote No. 1 was updated to memorialize appearance of Complainant’s Counsel and that a new footnote (No. 8) was added to note additional submissions. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as amended. Ms. Simons made a motion and Mr. Alexy seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

18. **Anonymous v. Atlantic County One Stop Center (2023-93)**

- The Complainant’s request for reconsideration should be denied.
- The Council’s May 30, 2023 Administrative Order is reinstated and the Complainant has thirty (30) days to advise of their willingness to proceed on a non-anonymous basis. N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.3(k).
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Simons made a motion and Mr. Alexy seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

VIII. Court Decisions of GRC Complaints on Appeal: None

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

- Ciolek v. Twp. of Roxbury, 2023 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 1296 (App. Div. 2023): Plaintiff requested “all police reports [plus] notes” relating to two (2) individuals and an address during a specified period. The trial court held that the request sought criminal investigatory records. The trial court also held that the Defendant was not obligated to release information under N.J.S.A. 47:1A-3(b) because the underlying conduct was no longer under investigation. On appeal, the Appellate Division held that because they do not have access to the reports deemed criminal investigatory records, they could not determine whether disclosable 3(b) information was contained therein. The court therefore ordered the trial court to conduct an *in camera* review to make said determination. Remanded.

X. Complaints Adjudicated in U.S. District Court: None

XI. Public Comment:

- Will Fenwick, Esq., Counsel for Borough of North Arlington: Mr. Fenwick asked when the Council would address the deferred issue of prevailing party attorney fees. Mr. Caruso discussed the GRC’s procedures related to addressing all outstanding issues upon completion of compliance in response to an Interim Order.

- Anonymous (GRC Complaint No. 2023-93): Anonymous asked why they were denied the ability to file a Denial of Access Complaint anonymously. Mr. Caruso stated that the Council's reasoning for being denied will be included in the decision sent to the parties within five (5) to ten (10) business days after the meeting.

XII. Adjournment:

Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to end the Council meeting. Ms. Simons made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Alexy. The motion passed by a unanimous vote. The meeting adjourned at 2:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robin Berg Tabakin, Esq., Chair

Date Approved: October 3, 2023

Appendix A – Vincent Conti v. NJ Civil Service Commission
Complaints Withdrawn on July 20, 2023

1. GRC 2022-589
2. GRC 2022-590
3. GRC 2022-591
4. GRC 2022-592
5. GRC 2022-593
6. GRC 2022-594
7. GRC 2022-595
8. GRC 2022-596
9. GRC 2022-597
10. GRC 2022-598
11. GRC 2022-599
12. GRC 2022-600
13. GRC 2022-601
14. GRC 2022-602
15. GRC 2022-603
16. GRC 2022-604