



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY PROSECUTOR COUNTY OF MONMOUTH

132 JERSEYVILLE AVENUE
FREEHOLD, NJ 07728-2374

(732) 431-7160

RAYMOND S. SANTIAGO
MONMOUTH COUNTY PROSECUTOR

July 1, 2026

ASK NJ Media
opra+request-92700-a073c80c@requests.opramachine.com

Re: records request dated June 24, 2026

To whom it may concern:

This office received a records request citing the Open Public Records Act (OPRA) and the common-law right of access from you via email on Wednesday, June 24. Specifically, you requested the following records:

1. *"Documents or statements sufficient to show the current (2026) annual salaries of Raymond S. Santiago, Julia Alonso, Christopher J. Decker, John G. McCabe, Jr., Richard Chapman, Steven Padula;*
2. *Documents or statements sufficient to show the salaries paid to Raymond S. Santiago, Julia Alonso, Christopher J. Decker, John G. McCabe, Jr., Richard Chapman, Steven Padula during the year 2025;*
3. *Documents or statements sufficient to show all benefits bestowed upon Raymond S. Santiago, Julia Alonso, Christopher J. Decker, John G. McCabe, Jr., Richard Chapman, Steven Padula during the year 2026, including but not limited to health insurance, pension benefits, government vehicles, government issued cell phones, EZPass/parking permits, stipends/allowances, bonuses, cell phone bill reimbursement or other perks.*
4. *Documents of statements sufficient to show all benefits bestowed upon Raymond S. Santiago, Julia Alonso, Christopher J. Decker, John G. McCabe, Jr., Richard Chapman, Steven Padula during the year 2025, including but not limited to health insurance, pension benefits, government vehicles, government issued cell phones, EZPass/parking permits, stipends/allowances, bonuses, cell phone bill reimbursement or other perks.*
5. *Documents, statements, or invoices sufficient to show all reimbursement payments made to Raymond S. Santiago, Julia Alonso, Christopher J. Decker, John G. McCabe, Jr., Richard Chapman, Steven Padula during the year 2026; (and)*
6. *Documents, statements, or invoices sufficient to show all reimbursement payments made to Raymond S. Santiago, Julia Alonso, Christopher J. Decker, John G. McCabe, Jr., Richard Chapman, Steven Padula during the year 2025."*

Turning first to the OPRA prong of your request:

Please be advised that each element of this request is massively overly broad, rendering them invalid under voluminous OPRA case law and statutory definitions.

A valid OPRA request *"must be well defined so that the custodian knows precisely what records are sought. The request should not require the records custodian to undertake a subjective analysis to*

understand the nature of the request.” Paff v. Galloway Township., 229 N.J. 340, 355 (N.J. Supreme Court 2017). Citation of an unspecified number of an unspecified type of “*documents or statements ... sufficient to show*” certain information constitutes language that is vague and unclear, failing to define any specific records at all, and thus falling well short of this standard and necessitating the brand of subjective analysis that Custodians of Records are explicitly under no obligation whatsoever to perform.

More specifically, conducting a good-faith search of our records in accordance with these elements of your request would necessitate piecemeal polling and/or the manual review of the physical and digital files of many of the current and former representatives of an Office that employs approximately 275 people. Such an effort would constitute extensive and exhaustive research. Under OPRA, a Custodian of Records has no such obligations, pursuant to *Bent v. Stafford Police Dep’t* (App. Div. 2005). Likewise, records requests that require a Custodian to exercise discretion in interpretation, survey employees, or undertake research to determine whether a particular record is responsive are overly broad and also invalid under OPRA, pursuant to *Doe v. Rutgers* (App. Div. 2021); *N.J. Builders Ass’n v. N.J. Council on Affordable Hous.* (App. Div. 2007); and *Renna v. County of Union* (App. Div. 2009) (request must contain sufficient information to enable custodian to make threshold determination as to nature of request and whether it falls within scope of OPRA).

As such, your request is respectfully denied.

Turning now to the common-law prong of your request, as you may know, each such request must be subject to a balancing test, in which the requestor’s interest in obtaining the requested records is weighed against the record stewards’ interest in maintaining their confidentiality. In the absence of a clearly articulable specific interest on the part of the requestor, however, the aforementioned balancing test is impossible to perform. Furthermore, we assert that our same arguments against disclosure under OPRA also apply under the common law.

Accordingly, your request is also respectfully denied under the common law.

However, it should also be noted that pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10, a public servant’s “*name, title, position ... (and) salary*” constitute public information subject to public access, as part of an extremely limited subset of personnel records fitting such a description.

As such, attached to this email please find a digital file reflecting this information for the individuals you referenced, for the 2025 and 2026 calendar years.

Should you disagree with any portion of this determination, you may appeal to the GRC or the New Jersey Superior Court as provided by N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6 and 7. In the event of a clarification or appeal, this office reserves the right to raise any other ground for denial not raised in this response. The failure of this office to assert an exception or privilege at this time does not act as a waiver of any grounds for denial.

Very truly yours,
RAYMOND S. SANTIAGO
MONMOUTH COUNTY PROSECUTOR

/s/ *Mark Spivey*

By: Mark Spivey
Public Information Officer
OPRA Custodian of Records