

Is OPRA open to misuse by public?

This article was published on Dec 5, 2010 by The Star News Group Township of Wall

This analysis document of the corruption therein and fraud is published on

<http://thomascaggiano.com/101216DCAGRCfraud.pdf>

continues

[Here is the published newspaper report by the Cross Star reporter and my after actions](#)

By Jamie Biesiada

WALL TOWNSHIP — Though the Open Public Records Act [**OPRA**] was designed to increase transparency in government, it can become a burden on municipalities — including Wall Township, where one resident has cost the township thousands of dollars in employee man-hour costs to fulfill her voluminous records requests.

Since June, township resident Betsy Cross has made nearly 130 **OPRA** requests to Wall, township officials estimate. Those requests do not include question-filled e-mails sent by Ms. Cross to various township officials, Township Administrator Joseph Verruni pointed out.

The township committee has archived the resident's informal, e-mailed questions, which fill several binders.

Those **OPRA** requests do not come without a cost, either — Mr. Verruni estimates Ms. Cross' requests have cost the taxpayers \$14,347, due to approximately 267 hours of staff time spent fulfilling the **OPRA** requests.

"I believe my numbers are conservative," Mr. Verruni said last week, of the man hours and cost to taxpayers.

In order to calculate his estimate, Mr. Verruni said he spoke with department heads that have provided information to fulfill Ms. Cross' requests. He asked them for an estimate of time spent fulfilling the requests.

The department heads have been keeping records of that time, Mr. Verruni said, but not from the very beginning, when Ms. Cross began making the requests earlier this year — and that, he explained, is one reason he believes his cost estimate is conservative.

Once time estimates were in, Mr. Verruni said, he calculated the price of employees' time

based on an entry-level position salary.

"It truly is an estimate," Mayor George Newberry said. "The numbers that he [Mr. Verruni] is looking at are probably conservative."

"Access to government records in the State of New Jersey is dictated not only by the [**OPRA**], but also by other state and federal statutes, regulations, and resolutions of the Legislature and the governor," Ms. Cross said this week, in an e-mailed statement.

"They were created for transparency to the public and everything I have requested all falls within the realm of Wall Township's daily work day," Ms. Cross continued. "Further, none of my requests would have been necessary if Wall Township had answered my questions at the town meetings I had attended."

She continued, "When a taxpayer's questions are dismissed or simply not answered how does one propose to get answers? **OPRA** requests were then my only option."

Ms. Cross and Assemblyman Dave Rible [R-11] have met in person to discuss some of her issues with Wall Township, "because she feels that she wasn't getting enough on the local level and she wanted to take it to the state level," Assemblyman Rible said.

"I think Betsy Cross is a concerned taxpayer, and she wants to know where her money is being spent," Assemblyman Rible added, "but what is the end-game? ... What is the ultimate problem that she has with the township?"

"I can't say she's abusing [the **OPRA** system] because I don't have the fact sheet in front of me, but ... it's something we need to look into because, at what point does it need to stop?" he asked. "I think the people should have the right and the ability to access the information, but at some point, maybe we do need to look at the excessiveness of it."

A list of **OPRA** requests made by Ms. Cross, created by township officials, breaks down the requests she has made into broad categories — including personnel, salary, budget and benefits information.

For instance, on July 16, Ms. Cross requested multiple salary-related items, including how much was paid in sick pay, salary, vacation pay, comp pay, overtime pay and early retirement in 2009. Each item was a different **OPRA** request, according to the township.

The majority of Ms. Cross' requests are categorized by the township as benefits-related, and revolve around the township's health insurance plans.

As an example, on June 21, Ms. Cross requested information on the breakdown of how many employees have single or family coverage; what eligibility is for benefits; the year the current benefits took effect; and plan summaries of dental, vision, prescription and disability [Ms. Cross did not include health, as she already had requested that information], according to the township's summary of her **OPRA** requests.

Under the township's heading of "miscellaneous," Ms. Cross requested such information as the home addresses for the five committee members, Chief of Police David Morris and Mr. Verruni, among other requests.

According to the list, approximately just more than one-half of Ms. Cross' requests have been fulfilled by the township.

The rest of the requests have been denied for a variety of reasons, according to the list, including denials based on confidential information; no document meeting the request exists; some items are exempt from **OPRA** requests; and the request in question is not an **OPRA** request.

"I have simply followed the rules that are in place to better assess if our township is doing business in the best interests of the taxpayer," Ms. Cross said, in an e-mail this week. "They should be doing and making well thought out and considered decisions on taxpayers' behalf."

"The **OPRA** system certainly was not designed for this purpose," Mr. Verruni said.

The system was meant for those who wish to find out more information about a certain topic, or more in-depth information, he explained.

"This puts significant time restraints on our employees doing other functions, and it is becoming a real problem," Mr. Verruni said, as the staff cannot perform other duties while fulfilling Ms. Cross' requests.

"We have tried to be as open and transparent as we can possibly be," Mayor Newberry said. "That said, I know Committeeman Hoffman in particular started in the beginning to really try to work with Ms. Cross and give her as much information as possible."

The information provided did not satisfy the situation, the mayor said.

"Right now, it has become difficult at best to continue to try to meet the requests," Mayor Newberry said, pointing out Ms. Cross does have the legal right to request information from the township.

The mayor stressed he has offered to meet with Ms. Cross and township employees to answer her questions, but no meeting has occurred.

"It is becoming burdensome to the staff," Mayor Newberry said.

The governing body has also expressed frustration with the requests, noting Ms. Cross has never stated what end result she is seeking.

Township attorney Joseph Oxley said Wall has gone "above and beyond" when filling Mr. Cross' requests.

"The township has bent over backwards to be accommodating," he said.

Mr. Oxley continued, "This is not what the process was designed for."

OPRA was designed, he said, to provide documents, like budgets, to interested parties. "A budget is a document that you know is sitting someplace in every municipality in Monmouth County," Mr. Oxley said. "That [providing existing documents] is what this [**OPRA**] was truly designed to do."

Of Ms. Cross, he said, "She is clearly pushing an envelope here, but the municipality will continue to bend over backwards to be open and transparent — not just for Betsy, but for all its residents."

Mr. Oxley was of the same opinion as the mayor — many of Ms. Cross' questions could be answered through sit-down meetings, as have occurred with multiple other residents throughout the years.

"Taxes are high, many people are struggling financially, school budgets can't get passed and yet we are simply to accept that the township has done everything it can to cut costs and perform its due diligence at the municipal level?" Ms. Cross asked, in an e-mail this week.

She continued, "Before Mr. Verruni starts making unsubstantiated declarations concerning my legitimate requests, perhaps we should make sure that Wall Township has gotten its own house in order first."

For several months, Ms. Cross has regularly attended Wall Township Committee meetings. She attended the Nov. 23 committee meeting.

Before Ms. Cross spoke during the public comment portion of the meeting, Mayor Newberry said after a prior workshop meeting of the committee, Ms. Cross had been invited to a meeting with Mr. Verruni, himself and Mr. Oxley.

The mayor said the township was willing to schedule meetings with Ms. Cross to tackle two of her questions per sitting.

Ms. Cross had sent an e-mail to the township, stating she had a busy month, Mayor Newberry said, and she also stated there would be no point in having a meeting if she was not provided information she had requested by the township.

Mr. Verruni said Ms. Cross had received all the information she had ever requested from the township.

Ms. Cross spoke several times during the meeting on various issues, at one point calling for the resignation of Mr. Verruni for what she believed was the mismanagement of Wall. She said he should resign because he chose to continue to do business with a company that had lost its New Jersey state third party administrator license.

"That hurts my feelings, Betsy," Mr. Verruni responded.

Mayor Newberry said Ms. Cross has "pushed this to the extreme."

The mayor also said the township is "very lucky" to count Mr. Verruni among its employees.

"I'll stand behind him," Mayor Newberry said, to applause from the audience.

Ms. Cross spoke again, stating she would like to have certain information ready for her the next morning.

"I respect you as a resident of this town. You don't run this town," Mayor Newberry said to Ms. Cross. "Betsy is not the priority of Wall Township."

After the public comment portion of the meeting was closed, the mayor said he had spoken to the committee members in attendance earlier in the evening regarding Ms. Cross.

"We have work to do," the mayor said, explaining the committee had to concentrate on crafting a budget for next year, especially considering there are state-level changes that have not yet occurred that will affect the township's spending plan.

Mayor Newberry said he is in the municipal building nearly every day, and he often hears of the latest event regarding Ms. Cross from township employees.

The committee and employees have work to do, the mayor said, outside of fulfilling Ms. Cross' requests.

"The events could be cured," he continued, if Ms. Cross would schedule meetings with township officials.

Committeeman Jeffrey Foster said he had received an e-mail from Ms. Cross dated Tuesday, Nov. 23, the date of the committee's meeting. He read the e-mail, addressed to Mr. Verruni and the committee, out loud.

"I understand you are in the process of soliciting quotes for life, health, dental and vision for your 2/1/2010 renewals," he read. He also stated "2010" should have read "2011."

He continued reading the e-mail: "Given my extensive background of insurance and reinsurance I would also like to be part of the quoting and idea process for Wall Township for this upcoming renewal. I would also mention all of my licenses are update [sic].

"Please send me the same package of data that you have sent the other firms and let me know if you need anything else from me in the meantime."

Committeeman Foster said, after he finished reading the e-mail, "Now we know what the motive is."

After the meeting, Ms. Cross confirmed that the e-mail was sent by her. She said she would like to be part of a committee of citizens to discuss issues in Wall Township.

When asked if the e-mail was a solicitation of business from the township, Ms. Cross said she had yet to see evidence of the township going out for requests for professional services [RFPs].

"I want to find out if they sent out RFPs," she said. "When I get that answer, I'll let you know what that [the e-mail] is, because I didn't get my answer."

According to Lisa Ryan, public information officer of the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs [DCA], residents filing voluminous **OPRA** requests is not unheard of in New Jersey.

The Government Records Council [GRC], which oversees the administration of the OPRA, and which itself is overseen by the DCA, "is aware of a similar situation with a former resident of the Borough of Stanhope in Sussex County," Ms.

Ryan said.

The GRC hears complaint filed by citizens who believe they were illegally denied access to a certain record.

Thomas Caggiano was the complainant in the case, and filed a records complaint with the GRC regarding certain OPRA requests that were not filled by the borough, according to the GRC's final decision in the complaint, dated Oct. 31, 2007.

The complaint can be downloaded in full at <http://www.nj.gov/grc/decisions/pdf/2007-161.pdf>.

Mr. Caggiano had filed multiple OPRA requests with the borough — 240 up to Sept. 21, 2007, and 486 in 2006, according to the GRC.

Records for 2007 regarding the resident were kept until Sept. 21, 2007, the date the borough's custodian of records filed a statement of information to the GRC.

Mr. Caggiano's case was brought to the GRC after he filed his records complaint with the council.

The GRC's decision states that "the evidence of record indicates that the Complainant in this complaint commenced the complaints 'in bad faith, solely for the purpose of harassment.'"

The decision lists several reasons Mr. Caggiano had acted in bad faith: only three record requests were denied, because the records did not exist; seven records proffered by the custodian were rejected by Mr. Caggiano; the custodian provided access to all but one record the day Mr. Caggiano's denial of access complaint was filed; in spite of the disclosure of the records, an "instant" denial of access complaint was filed; Mr. Caggiano had not informed the GRC records had been made available to him before filing a denial of access complaint; and "the number and frequency of OPRA requests filed with the Borough of Stanhope by the Complainant in 2006 and 2007."

The GRC's decision several times references the amount of OPRA requests made by Mr. Caggiano, including the borough's custodian reporting "that her office is overwhelmed with OPRA requests filed by the Complainant."

"The Custodian contends that '[h]andling the hundreds of OPRA requests submitted by [the Complainant] continues to cause substantial disruption of the operations of the Clerk's Office and continues to cause duress to the Custodian,'" the GRC decision also states.

Mr. Caggiano's denial of access complaint was dismissed by the GRC.

One of the problems with **OPRA** experienced by officials in Avon-by-the-Sea, is that the town has received requests from businesses that are using the statute to solicit clients, Borough Administrator and Clerk Tim Gallagher said.

"We'll get blanket requests for all air-conditioning permits handed out in the last three

years [for example],” Mr. Gallagher said. “The air-conditioning company will give that request.”

Or, for example, a roofing company will request similar information pertaining to roofs, Mr. Gallagher said, adding that these requests have been going on for about one year.

“I think that’s clear abuse of the **OPRA** system,” Assemblyman Rible said of the situation in Avon.

“The **OPRA** system is designed for people to get information regarding how the government is working. When you’re trying to get personal information, I think that’s a complete abuse of the system, and if that’s something being conducted then that’s something we, as a Legislature, need to look at.

“As far as the government is concerned, we should be an open book and people should be able to get as much information as they need from us,” Assemblyman Rible added. Other town officials in The **Coast** Star coverage area did not report any excessive **OPRA** requests.

=====

I, Thomas Caggiano, called the Town Administrator Joseph Verruni, 732-449-8444 ext 216, who did NOT return my telephone call as I advised his staff the GRC panel, its executive director Catherine Stargill were corrupt and that I was a witness to the FBI in Washington D.C., in New Jersey and Nv (See the FBI Letter published on <http://thomascaggiano.com/fbi.jpg>)

I also send him an email and also notified The Star Cross Publisher, General Manager and reporter that they should have contacted me if they were going to use the false analysis by the Government Record Council to be used to diminish the importance of the New Open Public Record Act that has increased transparency and lowered the high costs of 75 cents a page for as stated by Sen Weinberg a key sponser of the New OPRA to bring it into the digital age, NO forms are needed as previously required, the costs are lowered and the Government Data IS the People’s Data. You can now send in based upon the Senate and General Assembly Bill signed into Law by Gov Chris Christie, Open Public Record Acts by email, fax or letter.

I also contacted the Department of Community Affairs’ Hollie Gilroy’s office and notified her staff the findings published by the GRC were fraudulent and simply read our published web site <http://thomascaggiano.com> or <http://freedomnewsdigest.com> and that the NEW OPRA would increase transparency in Govt and reduce corruption in New Jersey.

I also called Assemblyman Rible staff and gave them recommendations on changes to laws to reduce corruption and advised him to contact Assemblywoman Mc Hose D-24 as she and her father D-24 Senator, retired, Richard Littell both requested crimnal investigations as has the Sussex County Administrator AFTER I was illegally imprisoned for 85 days. The Borough fired its Town Administrator Richard Stewart on Dec 2, 2010 as he was cooperating with the FBI and State Police Official Corruption Bureau. I suggest the excellent Sr. Case managers Frank Caruso and Dara Lownie be contacted NOT the corrupt Department of Community Affairs Commissioner, GRC panel or my comments on

the GRC web site.

Read what are called comprehensive minutes by the GRC and see if you can determine what the findings are or what the complaint was for denial of access. YOU can't as there is NO transparency in the corrupt GRC.

<http://www.nj.gov/grc/meetings/minutes/2007pdf/20101026OpenSession.pdf>

and my response to the corrupt GRC published on

<http://thomascaggiano.com/101211grc.pdf>

I certify the foregoing statements made by me are true. I am aware that if any of the foregoing statements made by me are willfully false that I am subject to punishment.

This document is published on

<http://thomascaggiano.com/http://thomascaggiano.com/101216DCAGRCfraud.pdf>

and is published as a public duty to reduce corrupiton. The hard copy was mailed to the Office of Gov of New Jersey and FBI in Washington D.C. and distributed by email to the State Ethics Committee, GRC, Sussex County Board of Chosen Freeholders, newspapers and others and posted on the State of New Jersey's Office of Attorney General's Department of Law and Public Safety criminal tip line reporting system.

That below file is published on

<http://thomascaggiano.com/101216dcjcriminalreport.pdf>

Thank You For Filling Out This Form

Below is what you submitted to dcjtipline@njdcj.org on Thursday, December 16, 2010 at 18:09:45

firstname: thomas

middlename: j

lastname: caggiano

address1: 7086 Arcadia Glen Court

city: North Las Vegas

state: NV

zip: 89084

areacode: 702

exch: 586

phone: 6768

topic: insurance fraud

tipinformation: This is a posting to the Office of Attorney General's Division of Criminal Justice in the Department of Law and Public Safety that has dozens of such reports of the unending corruption in the State of NJ by State, County and municipal officials. The corrupt Borough of Stanhope fired illegally its Town Administrator Richard Stewart on Dec 2, 2010 as he was reporting the criminal conduct of Borough of Stanhope officials to the FBI and State Police Official Corruption Bureau. On Dec 3, 2010 the corrupt Department of Community Affairs' GRC issued false findings by fraud in Thomas Caggiano v. GRC. On Dec 5, 2010 the Star Cross issued a published release based upon fraudulent data in the GRC and Department of Community Affairs to defame me and also used the report to at-

tack the OPRA itself.===== This report will be posted on <http://thomascaggiano.com/101216dcjcriminalreport.pdf> and distributed in other correspondence with a Verified Certified Affidavit mailed to the Office of Gov and FBI in Washington D.C. per direction to me by the Washington D.C. Office of Inspector General. The U.S.P.S. HQ Az office was notified of continuing mail fraud by the Department of Community Affairs and the GRC in preventing the detection and apprehension of a vast criminal conspiracy of which by the 36 page report filed in Sussex County Superior Court in Sussex County and the Appellate Division in my appeal of the corrupt Sussex County Superior Court Judge N. Peter Conforti, JSC and the corrupt Sussex County Prosecutor David Weaver and his corrupt Asst Prosecutor's continues without end and accelerating in criminal conduct and attacks upon those that they protect.===== Is OPRA open to misuse by public? This article was published on Dec 5, 2010 by The Star News Group Township of Wall This analysis document of the corruption therein and fraud is published on <http://thomascaggiano.com/101216DCAGRCfraud.pdf> continues Here is the published newspaper report by the Cross Star reporter and my after actions By Jamie Biesiada WALL TOWNSHIP – Though the Open Public Records Act [OPRA] was designed to increase transparency in government, it can become a burden on municipalities – including Wall Township, where one resident has cost the township thousands of dollars in employee man-hour costs to fulfill her voluminous records requests. Since June, township resident Betsy Cross has made nearly 130 OPRA requests to Wall, township officials estimate. Those requests do not include question-filled e-mails sent by Ms. Cross to various township officials, Township Administrator Joseph Verruni pointed out. The township committee has archived the resident's informal, e-mailed questions, which fill several binders. Those OPRA requests do not come without a cost, either – Mr. Verruni estimates Ms. Cross' requests have cost the taxpayers \$14,347, due to approximately 267 hours of staff time spent fulfilling the OPRA requests. "I believe my numbers are conservative," Mr. Verruni said last week, of the man hours and cost to taxpayers. In order to calculate his estimate, Mr. Verruni said he spoke with department heads that have provided information to fulfill Ms. Cross' requests. He asked them for an estimate of time spent fulfilling the requests. The department heads have been keeping records of that time, Mr. Verruni said, but not from the very beginning, when Ms. Cross began making the requests earlier this year – and that, he explained, is one reason he believes his cost estimate is conservative. Once time estimates were in, Mr. Verruni said, he calculated the price of employees' time based on an entry-level position salary. "It truly is an estimate," Mayor George Newberry said. "The numbers that he [Mr. Verruni] is looking at are probably conservative." "Access to government records in the State of New Jersey is dictated not only by the [OPRA], but also by other state and federal statutes, regulations, and resolutions of the Legislature and the governor," Ms. Cross said this week, in an e-mailed statement. "They were created for transparency to the public and everything I have requested all falls within the realm of Wall Township's daily work day," Ms. Cross continued. "Further, none of my requests would have been necessary if Wall Township had answered my questions at the town meetings I had attended." She continued, "When a taxpayer's questions are dismissed or simply not answered how does one propose to get answers? OPRA requests were then my only option." Ms. Cross and Assemblyman Dave Rible [R-11] have met in person to discuss some of her issues with Wall Township, "because she feels that she wasn't getting enough on the local level and she wanted to take it to the state level," Assemblyman Rible said. "I think Betsy Cross is a concerned taxpayer, and she wants to know where her money is being spent," Assemblyman Rible added, "but what is the end-game? ... What is the ultimate problem that she has with the township? "I can't say she's abusing [the OPRA system] because I don't have the fact sheet in front of me, but ... it's something we need to look into because, at what point does it need to stop?" he asked. "I think the people should have the right and the ability to access the information, but at some point, maybe we do need to look at the excessiveness of it." A list of OPRA requests made by Ms. Cross, created by township officials, breaks down the requests she has made into broad categories – including personnel, salary, budget and benefits information. For instance, on July 16, Ms. Cross requested multiple salary-related items, including how much was paid in sick pay, salary, vacation pay, comp pay, overtime pay and early retirement in 2009. Each item was a different OPRA request, according to the township. The majority of Ms. Cross' requests are categorized by the township as benefits-related, and revolve around the township's health insur-

ance plans. As an example, on June 21, Ms. Cross requested information on the breakdown of how many employees have single or family coverage; what eligibility is for benefits; the year the current benefits took effect; and plan summaries of dental, vision, prescription and disability [Ms. Cross did not include health, as she already had requested that information], according to the township's summary of her OPRA requests. Under the township's heading of "miscellaneous," Ms. Cross requested such information as the home addresses for the five committee members, Chief of Police David Morris and Mr. Verruni, among other requests. According to the list, approximately just more than one-half of Ms. Cross' requests have been fulfilled by the township. The rest of the requests have been denied for a variety of reasons, according to the list, including denials based on confidential information; no document meeting the request exists; some items are exempt from OPRA requests; and the request in question is not an OPRA request. "I have simply followed the rules that are in place to better assess if our township is doing business in the best interests of the taxpayer," Ms. Cross said, in an e-mail this week. "They should be doing and making well thought out and considered decisions on taxpayers' behalf." "The OPRA system certainly was not designed for this purpose," Mr. Verruni said. The system was meant for those who wish to find out more information about a certain topic, or more in-depth information, he explained. "This puts significant time restraints on our employees doing other functions, and it is becoming a real problem," Mr. Verruni said, as the staff cannot perform other duties while fulfilling Ms. Cross' requests. "We have tried to be as open and transparent as we can possibly be," Mayor Newberry said. "That said, I know Committeeman Hoffman in particular started in the beginning to really try to work with Ms. Cross and give her as much information as possible." The information provided did not satisfy the situation, the mayor said. "Right now, it has become difficult at best to continue to try to meet the requests," Mayor Newberry said, pointing out Ms. Cross does have the legal right to request information from the township. The mayor stressed he has offered to meet with Ms. Cross and township employees to answer her questions, but no meeting has occurred. "It is becoming burdensome to the staff," Mayor Newberry said. The governing body has also expressed frustration with the requests, noting Ms. Cross has never stated what end result she is seeking. Township attorney Joseph Oxley said Wall has gone "above and beyond" when filling Mr. Cross' requests. "The township has bent over backwards to be accommodating," he said. Mr. Oxley continued, "This is not what the process was designed for." OPRA was designed, he said, to provide documents, like budgets, to interested parties. "A budget is a document that you know is sitting someplace in every municipality in Monmouth County," Mr. Oxley said. "That [providing existing documents] is what this [OPRA] was truly designed to do." Of Ms. Cross, he said, "She is clearly pushing an envelope here, but the municipality will continue to bend over backwards to be open and transparent – not just for Betsy, but for all its residents." Mr. Oxley was of the same opinion as the mayor – many of Ms. Cross' questions could be answered through sit-down meetings, as have occurred with multiple other residents throughout the years. "Taxes are high, many people are struggling financially, school budgets can't get passed and yet we are simply to accept that the township has done everything it can to cut costs and perform its due diligence at the municipal level?" Ms. Cross asked, in an e-mail this week. She continued, "Before Mr. Verruni starts making unsubstantiated declarations concerning my legitimate requests, perhaps we should make sure that Wall Township has gotten its own house in order first." For several months, Ms. Cross has regularly attended Wall Township Committee meetings. She attended the Nov. 23 committee meeting. Before Ms. Cross spoke during the public comment portion of the meeting, Mayor Newberry said after a prior workshop meeting of the committee, Ms. Cross had been invited to a meeting with Mr. Verruni, himself and Mr. Oxley. The mayor said the township was willing to schedule meetings with Ms. Cross to tackle two of her questions per sitting. Ms. Cross had sent an e-mail to the township, stating she had a busy month, Mayor Newberry said, and she also stated there would be no point in having a meeting if she was not provided information she had requested by the township. Mr. Verruni said Ms. Cross had received all the information she had ever requested from the township. Ms. Cross spoke several times during the meeting on various issues, at one point calling for the resignation of Mr. Verruni for what she believed was the mismanagement of Wall. She said he should resign because he chose to continue to do business with a company that had lost its New Jersey state third party administrator license. "That hurts my feelings, Betsy," Mr.

Verruni responded. Mayor Newberry said Ms. Cross has “pushed this to the extreme.” The mayor also said the township is “very lucky” to count Mr. Verruni among its employees. “I’ll stand behind him,” Mayor Newberry said, to applause from the audience. Ms. Cross spoke again, stating she would like to have certain information ready for her the next morning. “I respect you as a resident of this town. You don’t run this town,” Mayor Newberry said to Ms. Cross. “Betsy is not the priority of Wall Township.” After the public comment portion of the meeting was closed, the mayor said he had spoken to the committee members in attendance earlier in the evening regarding Ms. Cross. “We have work to do,” the mayor said, explaining the committee had to concentrate on crafting a budget for next year, especially considering there are state-level changes that have not yet occurred that will affect the township’s spending plan. Mayor Newberry said he is in the municipal building nearly every day, and he often hears of the latest event regarding Ms. Cross from township employees. The committee and employees have work to do, the mayor said, outside of fulfilling Ms. Cross’ requests. “The events could be cured,” he continued, if Ms. Cross would schedule meetings with township officials. Committeeman Jeffrey Foster said he had received an e-mail from Ms. Cross dated Tuesday, Nov. 23, the date of the committee’s meeting. He read the e-mail, addressed to Mr. Verruni and the committee, out loud. “I understand you are in the process of soliciting quotes for life, health, dental and vision for your 2/1/2010 renewals,” he read. He also stated “2010” should have read “2011.” He continued reading the e-mail: “Given my extensive background of insurance and reinsurance I would also like to be part of the quoting and idea process for Wall Township for this upcoming renewal. I would also mention all of my licenses are update [sic]. “Please send me the same package of data that you have sent the other firms and let me know if you need anything else from me in the meantime.” Committeeman Foster said, after he finished reading the e-mail, “Now we know what the motive is.” After the meeting, Ms. Cross confirmed that the e-mail was sent by her. She said she would like to be part of a committee of citizens to discuss issues in Wall Township. When asked if the e-mail was a solicitation of business from the township, Ms. Cross said she had yet to see evidence of the township going out for requests for professional services [RFPs]. “I want to find out if they sent out RFPs,” she said. “When I get that answer, I’ll let you know what that [the e-mail] is, because I didn’t get my answer.” According to Lisa Ryan, public information officer of the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs [DCA], residents filing voluminous OPRA requests is not unheard of in New Jersey. The Government Records Council [GRC], which oversees the administration of the OPRA, and which itself is overseen by the DCA, “is aware of a similar situation with a former resident of the Borough of Stanhope in Sussex County,” Ms. Ryan said. The GRC hears complaint filed by citizens who believe they were illegally denied access to a certain record. Thomas Caggiano was the complainant in the case, and filed a records complaint with the GRC regarding certain OPRA requests that were not filled by the borough, according to the GRC’s final decision in the complaint, dated Oct. 31, 2007. The complaint can be downloaded in full at <http://www.nj.gov/grc/decisions/pdf/2007-161.pdf>. Mr. Caggiano had filed multiple OPRA requests with the borough – 240 up to Sept. 21, 2007, and 486 in 2006, according to the GRC. Records for 2007 regarding the resident were kept until Sept. 21, 2007, the date the borough’s custodian of records filed a statement of information to the GRC. Mr. Caggiano’s case was brought to the GRC after he filed his records complaint with the council. The GRC’s decision states that “the evidence of record indicates that the Complainant in this complaint commenced the complaints ‘in bad faith, solely for the purpose of harassment.’” The decision lists several reasons Mr. Caggiano had acted in bad faith: only three record requests were denied, because the records did not exist; seven records proffered by the custodian were rejected by Mr. Caggiano; the custodian provided access to all but one record the day Mr. Caggiano’s denial of access complaint was filed; in spite of the disclosure of the records, an “instant” denial of access complaint was filed; Mr. Caggiano had not informed th GRC records had been made available to him before filing a denial of access complaint; and “the number and frequency of OPRA requests filed with the Borough of Stanhope by the Complainant in 2006 and 2007.” The GRC’s decision several times references the amount of OPRA requests made by Mr. Caggiano, including the borough’s custodian reporting “that her office is overwhelmed with OPRA requests filed by the Complainant.” “The Custodian contends that ‘[h]andling the hundreds of OPRA requests submitted by [the Complainant] continues to cause substantial disruption of the op-

erations of the Clerk's Office and continues to cause duress to the Custodian,'" the GRC decision also states. Mr. Caggiano's denial of access complaint was dismissed by the GRC. One of the problems with OPRA experienced by officials in Avon-by-the-Sea, is that the town has received requests from businesses that are using the statute to solicit clients, Borough Administrator and Clerk Tim Gallagher said. "We'll get blanket requests for all air-conditioning permits handed out in the last three years [for example]," Mr. Gallagher said. "The air-conditioning company will give that request." Or, for example, a roofing company will request similar information pertaining to roofs, Mr. Gallagher said, adding that these requests have been going on for about one year. "I think that's clear abuse of the OPRA system," Assemblyman Rible said of the situation in Avon. "The OPRA system is designed for people to get information regarding how the government is working. When you're trying to get personal information, I think that's a complete abuse of the system, and if that's something being conducted then that's something we, as a Legislature, need to look at. "As far as the government is concerned, we should be an open book and people should be able to get as much information as they need from us," Assemblyman Rible added. Other town officials in The Coast Star coverage area did not report any excessive OPRA requests.

===== I, Thomas Caggiano, called the Town Administrator Joseph Verruni, 732-449-8444 ext 216, who did NOT return my telephone call as I advised his staff the GRC panel, its executive director Catherine Stargill were corrupt and that I was a witness to the FBI in Washington D.C., in New Jersey and Nv (See the FBI Letter published on <http://thomascaggiano.com/fbi.jpg>) I also send him an email and also notified The Star Cross Publisher, General Manager and reporter that they should have contacted me if they were going to use the false analysis by the Government Record Council to be used to diminish the importance of the New Open Public Record Act that has increased transparency and lowered the high costs of 75 cents a page for as stated by Sen Weinberg a key sponser of the New OPRA to bring it into the digital age, NO forms are needed as previously required, the costs are lowered and the Government Data IS the People's Data. You can now send in based upon the Senate and General Assembly Bill signed into Law by Gov Chris Christie, Open Public Record Acts by email, fax or letter. I also contacted the Department of Community Affairs' Hollie Gilroy's office and notified her staff the findings published by the GRC were fraudulent and simply read our published web site <http://thomascaggiano.com> or <http://freedomnewsdigest.com> and that the NEW OPRA would increase transparency in Govt and reduce corruption in New Jersey. I also called Assemblyman Rible staff and gave them recommendations on changes to laws to reduce corruption and advised him to contact Assemblywoman Mc Hose D-24 as she and her father D-24 Senator, retired, Richard Littell both requested criminal investigations as has the Sussex County Administrator AFTER I was illegally imprisoned for 85 days. The Borough fired its Town Administrator Richard Stewart on Dec 2, 2010 as he was cooperating with the FBI and State Police Official Corruption Bureau. I suggest the excellent Sr. Case managers Frank Caruso and Dara Lownie be contacted NOT the corrupt Department of Community Affairs Commissioner, GRC panel or my comments on the GRC web site. Read what are called comprehensive minutes by the GRC and see if you can determine what the findings are or what the complaint was for denial of access. YOU can't as there is NO transparency in the corrupt GRC. <http://www.nj.gov/grc/meetings/minutes/2007pdf/20101026OpenSession.pdf> and my response to the corrupt GRC published on <http://thomascaggiano.com/101211grc.pdf> I certify the foregoing statements made by me are true. I am aware that if any of the foregoing statements made by me are willfully false that I am subject to punishment. This document is published on <http://thomascaggiano.com/http://thomascaggiano.com/101216DCAGRCfraud.pdf> and is published as a public duty to reduce corruption. The hard copy was mailed to the Office of Gov of New Jersey and FBI in Washington D.C. and distributed by email to the State Ethics Committee, GRC, Sussex County Board of Chosen Freeholders, newspapers and others and posted on the State of New Jersey's Office of Attorney General's Department of Law and Public Safety criminal tip line reporting system. That file is published on <http://thomascaggiano.com/101216dcjcriminalreport.pdf>

Submit: Submit

