



FINAL DETERMINATION

IN THE MATTER OF

**CALVIN GODFREY,
Requester**

v.

**LANCASTER CITY,
Respondent**

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Docket No: AP 2026-3220

On July 3, 2026, Calvin Godfrey (“Requester”) submitted a request (“Request”) to Lancaster City (“City”) pursuant to the Right-to-Know Law (“RTKL”), 65 P.S. §§ 67.101 *et seq.*, seeking:

[1] Any and all contracts between the [C]ity [] and Go Vocal (a Belgian software firm formerly known as CitizenLab prior to 2024).

[2] Any documents that chronicle payments, to date, between the [C]ity and the above company.

[3] Any archived communications between former mayor Danene Sorace and representatives of the company.¹

On July 29, 2026, after invoking a thirty-day extension to respond, *see* 65 P.S. § 67.902(b), the City produced 13 pages of invoices and contracts, but argued that Item 2 is insufficiently specific insofar as it seeks any other documents. 65 P.S. § 67.703. The City also denied Item 3, arguing that responsive records do not exist.

¹ The Request listed the following keywords: “‘Danene Sorace’ AND ‘CitizenLab’ ‘Engage Lancaster!’ ‘Sarah Horton’ ‘Wietse Van Ransbeeck.’”

On August 6, 2026, the Requester appealed to the Office of Open Records (“OOR”), challenging the fee and stating grounds for disclosure.² The OOR invited both parties to supplement the record and directed the City to notify the OOR if any third parties have a direct interest in the appeal. 65 P.S. § 67.1101(c).

As the Appeals Officer assigned to this matter by the Office of Open Records (“OOR”), I have reviewed the appeal filed with the OOR, the City’s verified position statement, and the sworn affidavit of Barry N. Handwerger (“Handwerger Affidavit”), the City’s Open Records Officer (“AORO”).³ Based upon my review of the appeal and necessary evidence, I make the following conclusions of law and findings of fact:

- The City searched its current central accounting system for records related to the named vendor and produced the records it discovered. *See* Handwerger Affidavit, ¶ 3.a. AORO Handwerger also directed the proper officials to perform a keyword search of the former mayor’s computer drive and email history using the keywords provided by the Requester, which did not yield any results. *Id.*, ¶ 3.b. AORO Handwerger affirms that no additional responsive documents were found. *Id.*, ¶ 4. The Requester has not submitted sufficient, credible evidence to rebut the Handwerger Affidavit.
- The City argues that the entirety of Item 3, as well as the portion of Item 2 that seeks records other than invoices, are insufficiently specific. Section 703 of the RTKL requires that a request “identify or describe the record sought with sufficient specificity to enable which records are

² The Requester granted the OOR a thirty-day extension to issue a final determination. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.1101(b)(1) (“Unless the requester agrees otherwise, the appeals officer shall make a final determination which shall be mailed to the requester and the agency within 30 days of receipt of the appeal filed under subsection (a).”)

³ AORO Handwerger attests under the penalty of unsworn falsification to authorities, 18 Pa.C.S. § 4904, that the position statement is true and correct. On appeal, the Requester argues that the City failed to provide *email* communications between *staff* and the vendor. However, the Request was not limited to emails and sought *any* communications involving the mayor, not all staff. A requester may not modify or expand upon a request on appeal. *See McKelvey v. Off. of the Att’y Gen.*, 172 A.3d 122, 127 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2017).

being requested.” 65 P.S. § 67.703. In making this determination, we look to the nonexclusive, multifactor test employed by the Commonwealth Court in *Pa. Dep’t of Educ. v. Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 119 A.3d 1121 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2015), specifically: whether the request identifies a subject matter, a scope (i.e. the type of record or its recipients), and a timeframe. Here, the subject matter of Item 2 is payments involving the vendor, and Item 3 seeks unspecified communications with the vendor. The Items do not define a timeframe, although the City searched for records from January 1, 2020 to the present, suggesting that it had some idea of what timeframe was implicated. As for the scope, “any documents” and “any archived communications” do not provide a context to narrow the search. Based upon our application of the multifactor test, these portions of the Request are insufficiently specific. *See Godfrey v. Lancaster City*, OOR Dkt. AP 2025-2436; 2025 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 2886 (finding that the portion of the Requester’s request seeking “any and all communications” was insufficiently specific). The Requester is not prohibited from filing a new request that meets the requirements of 65 P.S. § 67.703.

For the foregoing reasons, the appeal is **denied**, and the City need not take any further action. This Final Determination is binding on all parties. Within thirty days of the mailing date of this Final Determination, any party may appeal or petition for review to the Lancaster County Court of Common Pleas. 65 P.S. § 67.1302(a). All parties must be served with notice of the appeal. The OOR also shall be served notice and have an opportunity to respond according to court rules as per 65 P.S. § 67.1303, but as the quasi-judicial tribunal adjudicating this matter, the OOR is not a proper party to any appeal and should not be named as a party.⁴ All documents or communications following the issuance of this Final Determination shall be sent to [oor-](#)

⁴ *Padgett v. Pa. State Police*, 73 A.3d 644, 648 n.5 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2013).

postfd@pa.gov. This Final Determination shall be placed on the website at:
<http://openrecords.pa.gov>.

FINAL DETERMINATION ISSUED AND MAILED: October 13, 2026

/s/ Blake Eilers

Blake Eilers, Esq.

Senior Appeals Officer

Delivered via e-file portal to: Calvin Godfrey; Barry N Handwerger