



**Minutes of the Government Records Council
March 28, 2017 Public Meeting – Open Session**

I. Public Session:

- **Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m. by Mr. Steven Ritardi at the Department of Community Affairs, Conference Room 129, Trenton, New Jersey.

- **Pledge of Allegiance**

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

- **Meeting Notice**

Mr. Ritardi 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 (fax number out of service), Trenton Times, Courier-Post (Cherry Hill), and the Secretary of State on March 23, 2017.”

Mr. Ritardi read the fire emergency procedure.

- **Roll Call**

Ms. Bordzoe called the roll:

Present: Kim Gatti, Esq. (designee of Department of Education Acting Commissioner Kimberley Harrington), Jason Martucci, Esq. (designee of Department of Community Affairs Commissioner Charles A. Richman), and Steven Ritardi, Esq. (Public Member).

Absent: Robin Tabakin, Esq. (Chairwoman)

GRC Staff in Attendance: Joseph Glover (Executive Director), Rosemond Bordzoe (Secretary), Frank F. Caruso (Communications Specialist/Resource Manager), John Stewart (Mediator), Samuel Rosado (Staff Attorney), and Deputy Attorney General Debra Allen

Mr. Ritardi informed the public that copies of the agenda are available by the conference room door.

II. Executive Director's Report:

Current Statistics

- Since OPRA's inception in calendar year 2002, the GRC has received 4,583 Denial of Access Complaints. That averages about 311 complaints per approximately 14¾ program years.
- In the current program year, the GRC has so far received 213 Denial of Access Complaints.
- 485 of the 4,583 complaints remain open and active. Of those open cases,
 - 19 complaints are on appeal with the Appellate Division (3.9%);
 - 17 complaints are currently in mediation (3.5%);
 - 45 complaints await adjudication by the Office of Administrative Law (9.3%);
 - 80 complaints are tentatively scheduled for adjudication at an upcoming GRC meeting, which includes the March 2017 meeting (17%); and,
 - 321 complaints are work in progress (66%).
- Since 2004, the GRC has received 26,565 total inquiries. That is an average of about 1,932 inquiries per a bit under 13¾ tracked program years. So far in the current program year, the GRC has received 1,419 inquiries.

III. Closed Session:

Mr. Ritardi read the Closed Session Resolution to go into closed session pursuant to N.J.S.A. 10:4-12(b)(7) to receive legal advice in the following matters:

- Regino De La Cruz, Esq. v. City of Union City (Hudson) (2015-14)
- Susan Barker v. Borough of Lakehurst (Ocean) (2015-26)

Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to go into closed session. Mr. Martucci made a motion, and Ms. Gatti seconded the motion. The Council adopted the motion by a unanimous vote.

The Council met in closed session from 1:39 p.m. until 1:50 p.m.

Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to end the closed session. Mr. Martucci made a motion, which was seconded by Ms. Gatti. The Council adopted the motion by a unanimous vote. Open Session reconvened at 1:52 p.m., and Ms. Bordzoe called roll.

Present: Ms. Gatti, Mr. Martucci, and Mr. Ritardi.

IV. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings:

- **February 21, 2017 Open Session Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to approve the open session minutes of the February 21, 2017 meeting. Ms. Gatti made a motion, seconded by Mr. Martucci. Ms. Gatti noted that she confirmed the accuracy of the minutes with Mr. Huber. The Council adopted the motion by a unanimous vote.

- **February 21, 2017 Closed Session Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to approve the open session minutes of the February 21, 2017 meeting. Mr. Martucci made a motion, seconded by Ms. Gatti, who noted that she confirmed the accuracy of the minutes with Mr. Huber. The Council adopted the motion by a unanimous vote.

V. New Business – Cases Scheduled for Adjudication

Mr. Ritardi 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. **James H. Maynard, Esq. v. Morris County Sheriff’s Department (2016-298) (SR and RBT Recusals)**

- The Council tabled the matter because a quorum could not be achieved.

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

1. **Abdul Griggs v. Union County Prosecutor’s Office (2016-271)**

- The parties settled the matter through mediation.

2. **Waymon Patrick Young v. Ocean County Superior Court (2017-17)**

- The complaint is not within the Council’s jurisdiction.

Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the recommendations as written in all of the above Administrative Complaint Dispositions. Mr. Martucci made a motion, which was seconded by Ms. Gatti. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

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

1. **Jeremy Mawhinney v. Atlantic County Sheriff’s Office (2015-277)**

2. **M.S. o/b/o A.S. v. Harrison Township Board of Education (Gloucester) (2015-404)**

3. **Vera Thomas v. Toms River Regional Schools (Ocean) (2016-294)**

4. **William Moore v. NJ Department of Banking and Insurance (2017-19)**
5. **Christa Hayes (o/b/o Teal Asset Recovery) v. City of Elizabeth (Union) (2017-23)**
6. **David H. Weiner v. City of Newark (Essex) (2017-36)**

VI. New Business – Cases Scheduled for Individual Complaint Adjudication

A. Individual Complaint Adjudications with Recusals: None

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

B. Individual Complaint Adjudications with no Recusals:

1. Demetrios Damplias v. NJ Department of Corrections (2014-96)

- The Custodian complied with the Interim Order.
- The Custodian shall comply with the findings of the in camera inspection.
- The knowing and willful analysis is deferred, pending the Custodian's compliance.
- Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Stewart advised the Council that it previously conducted an in camera review in this case and wanted additional information on the redaction of telephone numbers. Mr. Stewart noted that the issue was mooted by the custodian's disclosure of same to the complainant. Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Gatti made a motion, and Mr. Martucci seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

2. Regino De La Cruz, Esq. v. City of Union City (Hudson) (2015-14)

- The Custodian complied with the Interim Order.
- The Custodian improperly denied access to incident reports that pertain to matters related to the Division of Alcoholic Beverage Control by citing the criminal investigatory exemption. Nonetheless, such records are exempt from disclosure by regulation.
- The Custodian shall comply with the findings of the in camera inspection.
- The knowing and willful analysis is deferred, pending the Custodian's compliance.

3. Susan Barker v. Borough of Lakehurst (Ocean) (2015-26)

- The Custodian complied with the Interim Order.
- The Custodian lawfully denied access to the first two (2) sets of columns indicating the "Regular Time" and "Extra Time" worked. However, the Custodian unlawfully denied access to all remaining columns, with the exception of information in the "Case#" and "Explanation" columns that the Custodian believes is exempt. For the "Case#" and "Explanation" columns, the Custodian shall provide a lawful basis and detailed explanation for any redactions she intends to perform prior to disclosure.
- The Custodian shall comply with the findings of the in camera inspection.

- The Custodian bore her burden of proving that she lawfully denied access to additional records responsive to Item Nos. 2, 3, and 4 of the January 8, 2015 OPRA request.
- The knowing and willful analysis is deferred, pending the Custodian's compliance.
- Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Gatti made a motion, and Mr. Martucci seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

4. **Robert J. Chester v. Pleasantville Housing Authority (Atlantic) (2015-50)**

- The Custodian timely responded to the OPRA request but failed to provide a specific lawful basis for denying access.
- Requested item Nos. 1, 3 through 7, 11 through 20, 31, and 32 are invalid under OPRA because they are blanket requests for a class of various documents rather than requests for specifically named or identifiable records.
- The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the minutes responsive to requested item No. 2. The Custodian shall therefore disclose the approved minutes that are responsive to the request. Should the Custodian be able to refer the Complainant to the agency's website, he must do so in accordance with the Council's decision in Rodriguez v. Kean University, GRC Complaint No. 2013-69. Should the Custodian determine that any sets of minutes are exempt in part or whole, or that they do not exist, the Custodian must certify accordingly.
- The Custodian lawfully denied access to requested item No. 8 because no responsive documents exist.
- The Custodian lawfully denied access to requested item Nos. 9, 10, and 26 because they are personnel records that are exempt from access under N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10.
- The Custodian might have unlawfully denied access to requested item Nos. 21 through 25 and 27 through 30. The Custodian must therefore either disclose all responsive records and/or identify those records that he feels should be exempt from disclosure in part or whole and note the applicable exemptions. Should no records be responsive, the Custodian must certify accordingly.
- The knowing and willful and prevailing party analyses are deferred, pending the Custodian's compliance.
- Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Ritardi noted that he could see how the facts of the instant complaint would cause the custodian frustration in his initial response to the complainant. Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion, and Ms. Gatti seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

5. **Jeff Carter v. Borough of Paramus (Bergen) (2015-104)**
 - The Custodian did not bear her burden of proof that she timely responded to the OPRA request, thus resulting in a “deemed” denial.
 - Based on the conflicting evidence in the matter, the GRC is unable to determine whether the Custodian unlawfully denied access to the requested records. Therefore, the complaint should be referred to the Office of Administrative Law (“OAL”) for a hearing to resolve the facts.
 - The knowing and willful and prevailing party analyses are deferred, pending the OAL’s disposition of the matter.
 - Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Ritardi questions how the facts of the complaint ultimately led to an OAL referral when the complainant could have obtained records from the court. Mr. Ritardi also took issue with the term “pleadings” and its many interpretations. Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Gatti made a motion, and Mr. Martucci seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

6. **Richard B. Henry, Esq. v. Township of Hamilton Police Department (Atlantic) (2015-155)**
 - The Counsel tabled the matter because legal counsel needs more time for review.
 - Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to table this matter. Mr. Martucci made a motion, and Ms. Gatti seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

7. **Michael P. Reilly v. Monmouth Beach Police Department (Monmouth) (2015-241)**
 - The Custodian unlawfully denied access.
 - The Custodian violated N.J.S.A. 47:1A-3(b) by failing to provide information subject to disclosure following an arrest. However, the Custodian provided the responsive information via a record attached to the Statement of Information.
 - There is no knowing and willful violation.
 - Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations. Mr. Rosado noted that some edits were made to clear up the analysis without substantial changes in the proposed conclusions. Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as edited. Ms. Gatti made a motion, and Mr. Martucci seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

8. **Gavin C. Rozzi v. Ocean County Prosecutor’s Office (2015-250)**
 - The Custodian’s response was insufficient pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g).
 - The Council declines to order disclosure because the evidence reflects that the Custodian released all responsive records.
 - There is no knowing and willful violation.
 - Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion, and Ms. Gatti seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

9. **Luis F. Rodriguez v. Kean University (2015-269)**

- The Council tabled the matter on the advice of legal counsel.
- Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to table this matter. Mr. Martucci made a motion, and Ms. Gatti seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

10. **Oderi Yaan Caldwell v. Cape May County Correctional Center (Cape May) (2015-272)**

- The Warden failed to respond timely to the OPRA request, thus resulting in a “deemed” denial.
- There was no unlawful denial of access because the evidence indicates that no responsive records exist.
- There is no knowing and willful violation.
- Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Gatti made a motion, and Mr. Martucci seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

11. **Kevin M. O’Brien v. Borough of Hillsdale (Bergen) (2015-288)**

- The Custodian’s response was insufficient because she failed to state definitively that records responsive to requested items Nos. 1 and 3 did not exist and that other records were provided merely as an accommodation.
- There is no unlawful denial of access because the evidence shows that no responsive records exist.
- There is no knowing and willful violation.
- Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Gatti made a motion, and Mr. Martucci seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

12. **Luis F. Rodriguez v. Kean University (2015-290)**

- The issue of whether the Custodian was required to update the report to the Complainant’s specifications and provide same should be held in abeyance until the Supreme Court has ruled in Paff v. Galloway Township, 444 N.J. Super 495 (App. Div.) (*cert. granted* 227 N.J. 24 (2016)).
- The knowing and willful analysis is deferred, pending the removal of the abeyance and full adjudication of the complaint.
- Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Ritardi asked how Paff, 444 N.J. Super 495 impacted this complaint. Mr. Caruso replied that the Court’s decision in Paff, could impact whether a custodian is obligated to collate information in databases. Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion, and Ms. Gatti seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

13. **Stephen O. Gethange v. Middlesex County Prosecutor's Office (2015-294)**

- The Custodian has borne his burden of proving a lawful denial of access to requested item Nos. 1 through 6 and 8 because those records are criminal investigatory in nature and therefore exempt from disclosure.
- The Custodian has borne his burden of proving a lawful denial of access to requested item No. 7 because the evidence indicates that no responsive records exist.
- Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Gatti made a motion, and Mr. Martucci seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

14. **Luis F. Rodriguez v. Kean University (2015-312)**

- The Custodian failed to respond immediately to a request for immediate access records, thus resulting in a "deemed" denial.
- Based on unwarranted and unsubstantiated extensions, the Custodian did not timely respond to the portion of the request not seeking immediate access documents, thus resulting in a "deemed" denial.
- The Custodian has borne her burden of proof that she lawfully denied access to the OPRA request because she initially responded and later certified in the Statement of Information that no responsive records exist.
- There is no knowing and willful violation.
- Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion, and Ms. Gatti seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

15. **Luis F. Rodriguez v. Kean University (2015-324)**

- The Custodian did not bear her burden of proof that she responded immediately to a request for immediate access records, thus resulting in a "deemed" denial.
- The Custodian ultimately provided all responsive records.
- There is no knowing and willful violation.
- Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Gatti made a motion, and Mr. Martucci seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

16. **Thomas R. Ashley, Esq. (o/b/o Ralph Benjamin Cotto) v. Union County Prosecutor's Office (2015-337)**

- The Custodian's initial failure to locate responsive e-mails constitutes an insufficient search.
- The GRC must conduct an *in camera* review of the responsive e-mails to validate the Custodian's cited reasons for denial of access.

- The knowing and willful and prevailing party analyses are deferred, pending the Custodian’s compliance.
- Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion, and Ms. Gatti seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

17. **Laura Cintron v. NJ Department of Human Services, Ancora Psychiatric Hospital (2016-1)**

- The Custodian did not timely respond, thus resulting in a “deemed” denial.
- The Custodian lawfully denied access to requested items Nos. 1-4 because the evidence shows that no responsive records exist.
- The Custodian lawfully denied access to the requested PAR/PES evaluations because those records are exempt pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10.
- There is no knowing and willful violation.
- Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Gatti made a motion, and Mr. Martucci seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

18. **Luis F. Rodriguez v. Kean University (2016-40)**

- The Council must conduct an *in camera* review of the redacted records in order to validate the Custodian’s assertions that the redacted documents are, in fact, exempt from disclosure.
- The knowing and willful analysis is deferred, pending the Custodian’s compliance.
- Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Gatti made a motion, and Mr. Martucci seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

19. **S. Anthony Franklin v. NJ Department of Corrections (2016-93)**

- The records are exempt from disclosure by regulation.
- Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion, and Ms. Gatti seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

20. **Luis F. Rodriguez v. Kean University (2016-269)**

- The Custodian did not respond immediately to a request for immediate access records, thus resulting in a “deemed” denial.

- The Council declines to order disclosure because the Custodian provided responsive records.
- There is no knowing and willful violation.
- Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Gatti made a motion, and Mr. Martucci seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

VII. Court Decisions of GRC Complaints on Appeal:

- Williams v. Office, 2017 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 420, (App. Div. 2017): In another of the long line of favorable opinions about GRC decisions, the Appellate Division affirmed the Council’s decision that the custodian did not have an obligation to produce a copy of a transcript that did not exist.

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

- Smith v. Swedesboro-Woolwich Sch. Dist. Bd. of Educ. & Christopher Destratis, 2017 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 566 (App. Div. 2017): Here, the Appellate Division affirmed the trial court’s holding that the custodian properly redacted school board meeting minutes. The Court, after conducting an *in camera* review, found that it agreed with the trial court’s decision that:

[T]he Board's discussion, had with its legal counsel, assessing the superintendent's performance in order to determine whether it would renew the superintendent's contract, is protected from disclosure under the personnel records exception under OPRA, N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10; see McGee v. Twp. of E. Amwell, 416 N.J. Super. 602, 614-16, (App. Div. 2010), as well as the deliberative process and attorney-client privileges . . .

Id. at 6-7.

- Twp. of Teaneck & Issa Abbasi v. Jones, 2017 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 584 (March 9, 2017): Here, the trial court denied plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction against the defendant. Plaintiff had argued that defendant submitted 380 OPRA requests over a 2 month period after the Township denied defendant a settlement in an unrelated matter. The trial court held that injunctive relief was “unjustified under standard injunction jurisprudence, on this record, at this juncture.” Id. at 13.

In reaching this conclusion, the court reasoned that OPRA provided custodians a number of remedies when faced with “abusive, unreasonable, coercive, OPRA requests.” Id. at 12. The court noted that defendant withdrew all but 90 of his requests, which supported that an injunction was not necessary at this time. Further, the court stated that “[t]he lack of demonstrated imminent, irreparable harm is fatal to the request for preliminary injunctive relief.” Id. at 15 (citation omitted).

Of particular note, the court reasoned that “there is no well settled legal right to a total ban on OPRA requests, preliminarily or by way of permanent injunction, no matter how excessive in number the requests may be, and no matter how transparently designed the OPRA requests may be to coerce a settlement with public funds of a requestor's unrelated lawsuit.” *Id.* at 16. The GRC is aware of several decisions (at least at the law division level) that have limited and/or completely banned an individual from using OPRA.

However, it would also appear that this decision does leave the door open for a successful injunction in the future should the situation call for it.

- Paff v. Bergen Cnty. & Capt. William Edgar, 2017 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 627 (App. Div. 2017): Here, the Appellate Division reversed the trial court’s holding that plaintiff was entitled to unredacted records of internal affairs complaints, complete with complaining party and alleged employee. In reaching this conclusion, the Court rejected plaintiff’s argument that disclosure should have been viewed solely within the purview of OPRA with no consideration given to the Attorney General’s Internal Affairs Policies and Procedures (“IAPP”). The Court held that N.J.S.A. 47:1A-9 allowed for grants of confidentiality within IAPP (which the Court concluded did have the force of law) to be recognized under OPRA. **It should be noted that the Court did state that the GRC reached a similar conclusion in a few cases and cited to those cases in its decision.**

Finally, the Court determined that plaintiff was not a prevailing party simply because defendants committed a technical violation of OPRA. Such a decision is consistent with the Council’s previous holdings on fee issues where only a technical violation was at issue. *See Carter v. Franklin Fire Dist. No. 2 (Somerset)*, GRC Complaint No. 2012-101 (April 2013).

- Abdur-Raheem v. NJ Dep't of Corr., 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 39839 (2017): The U.S. District Court handled a number of issues here. However, of relevance to the GRC is the OPRA portion of the decision.

To that end, plaintiff filed claim for an unlawful denial of access and defendants countered with a motion to dismiss. The Court initially rejected defendant’s claim that it had no jurisdiction over OPRA matters. The Court reasoned that N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6 allowed for a requestor to file a complaint in a NJ court, and thus the U.S. District Court could take the case by “virtue of its supplemental jurisdiction . . .” *Id.* at 55. However, the Court stated that the claim had to be related to the federal claims raised in a case. The Court also noted that a plaintiff did not have an inherent right to supplemental jurisdiction, but that it was at the Court’s discretion.

Having discussed its ability to act on supplemental jurisdiction, the Court granted defendants motion. In reaching this conclusion, the Court reasoned that the custodian

was not a defendant to the over-arching case and that the OPRA requests did not relate to plaintiff's federal claims against the other parties.

XI. Public Comment:

X. Adjournment:

Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to end the Council meeting. Ms. Gatti made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Martucci. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 2:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Ritardi, Esq., Secretary

Date Approved: May 23, 2017