



MONROE TOWNSHIP SCHOOLS
423 Buckelew Avenue
Monroe Township, New Jersey 08831
www.monroe.k12.nj.us

DR. CHARI ROBYNNE CHANLEY

Superintendent of Schools

DR. ADAM M. LAYMAN

Acting Superintendent of Schools

LAURA ALLEN, CPA

Business Administrator/Board Secretary

Tel: 732-521-1500

Fax: 732-521-2719

October 14, 2025

VIA EMAIL: opra+request-81756-77aed099@requests.opramachine.com

Transparency Over Politics

Re: OPRA Request dated October 5, 2025

Dear Sir/Madam:

On behalf of the Custodian of Records, Laura Allen, for Monroe Township Board of Education ("Board" and/or "District"), I am writing this letter in response to your request for records pursuant to the Open Public Records Act ("OPRA") submitted on Sunday, October 5, 2020 and received on Monday, October 6, 2025.

More specifically, your request seeks access to:

"Emails between former Monroe Township Board President Christine "Chrissy" Skurbe and NJSBA Field Representative Mary Ann Friedman (or any other representative from the NJSBA) regarding the CSA Evaluation of Dr. Chari Chanley, between September-December 2023, including but not limited to the following key words: "evaluation," "Chanley," "Superintendent," "Superintendent evaluation," "complete," "board members"

As a preliminary matter, please note that in accord with MAG, *supra*, and its progeny, in order to specifically identify correspondence, OPRA requests must contain the following characteristics: content and/or subject; specific date or range of dates; and, sender and/or recipient. See Elcavage v. West Milford Twp. (Passaic), GRC Complaint No. 2009-07 (April 2010); Armenti v. Robbinsville Bd. of Educ. (Mercer), GRC Complaint No. 2009-154 (Interim Order dated May 24, 2011); Sandoval v. NJ State Parole Board, GRC Complaint No. 2006-167 (October 2008) and Schuler v. Borough of Bloomsbury, GRC Complaint No. 2007-151 (February 2009).

SUCCESS IS ALWAYS A TEAM EFFORT!!

Your request for emails with keywords “evaluation”, “superintendent”, “superintendent evaluation”, “complete”, and “board members” are overly broad in that the requests fail to include a narrowly construed subject or content and thus do not identify specific requested records. See Elcavage v. West Milford Twp. (Passaic), GRC Complaint No. 2009-07 (April 2010); Doss v. Borough of Paramus (Bergen), GRC Complaint No. 2014-149 (Interim Order dated January 30, 2015); Gannett New Jersey Partners L.P. v. County of Middlesex, 379 N.J. Super. 205, 211-12, 877 A.2d 330 (App. Div. 2005); New Jersey Builders Association v. New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing, 390 N.J. Super. 166, 178 (App. Div.), certify. Denied, 190 N.J. 394 (2007); Bent v. Stafford Police Dep’t, 381 N.J. Super. 30, 40 (App. Div. 2005); NJ Builders Assoc. v. NJ Council on Affordable Housing, 390 N.J. Super. 166, 180 (App. Div. 2007); Burke v. Brandes, 429 N.J. Super. 169, 172, 176 (App. Div. 2012). Under OPRA, one cannot submit “wholesale requests for general information to be analyzed, collated and compiled by the responding government entity.” MAG Entertainment, LLC v. Division of Alcoholic Beverage Control, 375 N.J. Super. 534, 868 A.2d 1067 (App. Div. 2005). (The Court found a request for “all books, records, [and] documents” related to a specific project to be improper.)

Your request contains generic keywords that can easily appear in a vast quantity of records without any specific meaning. There is no requirement pursuant to OPRA which requires the Board to attempt to locate responsive correspondence containing a single word of generic meaning without any context. See Elcavage v. West Milford Twp. (Passaic), GRC Complaint No. 2009-07 (April 2010); Burke v. Brandes, 429 N.J. Super. 169, 172, 176 (App. Div. 2012). Further, requiring a custodian to locate responsive correspondence based on a single generic keyword is clearly not consistent with the establishment of “subject or content” as one of the criteria for a valid correspondence search. See Sandoval v. NJ State Parole Board, GRC Complaint No. 2006-167 (October 2008), and Schuler v. Borough of Bloomsbury, GRC Complaint No. 2007-151 (February 2009). Most importantly, using generic keywords is analogous to the type of overly broad request that the MAG and NJ Builder Association Courts determined to be invalid.

Your request for emails with key words requires the Board to perform research and use judgement as to whether each correspondence is actually responsive to your request in order to respond properly. The OPRA does not require such actions. In addition, as composed, the request contains generic terms which do not constitute a valid subject or content. Accordingly, this portion of your request, as submitted, does not include all of the required criteria, is invalid pursuant to the OPRA, and is thus denied as overbroad.

However, your request for the term “Chanley” constitutes a request for correspondence containing a proper name, and thus the records are more easily identifiable as subject or content because a proper name cannot be used interchangeably. See Elcavage v. West Milford Twp. (Passaic), GRC Complaint No. 2009-07 (April 2010); Doss v. Borough of Paramus (Bergen), GRC Complaint No. 2014-149 (Interim Order dated January 30, 2015); Burke v. Brandes, 429 N.J. Super. 169, 172, 176 (App. Div. 2012). As such, please be advised there are no records responsive to this portion of your request.

SUCCESS IS ALWAYS A TEAM EFFORT!!

This correspondence and the foregoing information constitute the Board's full and complete response to your OPRA request and therefore, your OPRA request is closed.

Sincerely,

Lisa Goldstein

Lisa Goldstein
OPRA & Central Registration Secretary

SUCCESS IS ALWAYS A TEAM EFFORT!!