



FINAL DETERMINATION

IN THE MATTER OF	:	
	:	
DAVID HUGHES,	:	
Requester	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket No: AP 2026-3661
	:	
EXETER TOWNSHIP,	:	
Respondent	:	
	:	

On July 24, 2026, David Hughes (“Requester”) submitted a request (“Request”) to Exeter Township (“Township”) pursuant to the Right-to-Know Law (“RTKL”), 65 P.S. §§ 67.101 *et seq.*, stating the following: “Colleen Vallonio filed a Right-to-Know (RTK) with the township on November 14, 2024. Please provide a copy of this RTK and the documents requested in this RTK.”

On August 31, 2026, following an extension of time to respond, 65 P.S. § 67.902, the Township granted the Request in part, and provided a copy of the previous request and the records provided with that request. The Township denied the Request in part, because certain information contained within the responsive records had been redacted or withheld in the documents provided in the previous request and were redacted in this response as well.

On September 3, 2026, the Requester filed an appeal with the Office of Open Records (“OOR”), challenging the denials and stating grounds for disclosure. The Requester disputed the redactions and argued that email attachments were missing from the record and a presentation was

withheld. The OOR invited both parties to supplement the record and directed the Township to notify the OOR if any third parties have a direct interest in this appeal. 65 P.S. § 67.1101(c).

On September 16, 2026, the Township submitted its position statement, supported by the attestation of Larry Peirsol (“Peirsol Attestation”), Agency Open Records Officer (“AORO”). The Township argued that the Township interpreted the Request as seeking the records previously provided to Ms. Vallonio. Peirsol Attestation, ¶5. These records had been redacted and the records received by the Requester contained the same redactions. *Id.* at ¶¶6-7. In addition, the records provided to Ms. Vallonio did not include any attachments. *Id.* at ¶6.

On September 16, 2026, the Requester provided a rebuttal position statement, arguing that because he asked for the documents requested, not provided, the Township should have provided the reasons for redaction as well as attachments to emails from the prior request, a presentation referenced in the emails in the prior request, and a bond counsel memorandum.

Based upon my review of the appeal and evidence, I make the following conclusions of law and findings of fact:

- The Township properly responded to the Request and provided the responsive records. The Township’s reliance upon production of the documents previously provided and redacted identically is reasonable. In its production of documents, the Township provided the December 23, 2024, letter to Ms. Vallonio regarding her November 14, 2024, request, wherein it explained that names, email addresses, personal telephone numbers and mailing addresses were redacted per Section 708(b)(6) of the RTKL and the constitutional right to privacy. 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(6). In addition, the Peirsol Attestation attests that the names of Township constituents were redacted because those individuals had a reasonable expectation

of privacy in privately corresponding to members of the Township. Peirsol Attestation, ¶9.

- No attachments had been provided in the previous RTKL request, and the Requester is not prohibited from filing a new RTKL request for those attachments. *Id.* at ¶¶6, 8. The bond counsel memorandum was also properly withheld as attorney-client privilege. *Id.* at ¶10.
- The Township provided a copy of the presentation to the Requester via link.

For the foregoing reasons, the appeal is **denied** and the Township is not required to 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 Berks 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.¹ All documents or communications following the issuance of this Final Determination shall be sent to oor-postfd@pa.gov. This Final Determination shall be placed on the website at: <http://openrecords.pa.gov>.

FINAL DETERMINATION ISSUED AND MAILED: October 26, 2026

/s/ Meryl M. Peterman

MERYL M. PETERMAN, ESQ.
APPEALS OFFICER

Sent via OOR E-file appeal portal to: David Hughes
J. Chadwick Schnee, Esq.

¹ *Padgett v. Pa. State Police*, 73 A.3d 644, 648 n.5 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2013).