



Office of Missouri State Auditor
Nicole Galloway, CPA

Sunshine Law Review



Nicole Galloway, CPA
Missouri State Auditor

CITIZENS SUMMARY

Findings in the Sunshine Law Review

Background and Overall Conclusion

The Sunshine Law Review began with the random statistical selection of 326 political subdivisions from the 4,113 political subdivisions maintained in the State Auditor's Office database. To meet the objectives of the review, we sent a letter (see Appendix A) prepared in a manner that resembled a public records request from a private citizen. The letter requested minutes for the last board meeting held in 2015, along with the notice and agenda for that meeting. Political subdivisions were also asked to provide the name and contact information for the custodian of records. In addition, they were asked to respond if the entity had a policy or ordinance regarding recording of public meetings, and, if so, to provide a copy of the policy or ordinance.

We concluded that more than a third of political subdivisions included in our sample, or approximately 1,477 of the 4,113 (35.9 percent) political subdivisions, would not respond to a Sunshine Law request timely. In addition, based on the results of our statistical sample, we estimate 638 of the 4,113 (15.5 percent) political subdivisions would not respond at all to public record requests. We also estimate 2,686 of the 4,113 (65.3 percent) political subdivisions would not fully comply with public record requests. Some sampled political subdivisions did not respond to, denied, or delayed responses to the requests. By failing to properly and timely respond to requests or denying requests unjustifiably, political subdivisions risk fines, lawsuits, and loss of credibility with their constituency.

Response Compliance

Under the Sunshine Law, public entities have 3 days to respond or acknowledge receipt of the records request. Of the 326 request letters mailed on August 2, 2016, 309 letters were delivered to the recipient address, while 17 were not confirmed as delivered by the USPS. Of the 309 political subdivisions that received the public records request, 48 did not respond at all, for an error rate of 15.5 percent. Of the 261 responses received, 198 responses (75.9 percent) were sent within 3 days, while 63 political subdivisions (24.1 percent) provided responses after the 3 day timeline. Four political subdivisions denied the request unless we responded with clarification of the purpose of the request, provided how the information was to be used, or appeared in person to obtain the documents; none of which are allowable reasons under the law. Only 93 respondents (30.1 percent) of political subdivisions receiving our request, fully complied with all aspects of it.

Meeting Notices and Agendas

For meeting notices and agendas received as a part of our public record requests we evaluated compliance with meeting notice requirements including the following: (1) time; (2) date; (3) location; (4) tentative agenda; and; (5) proper citation of proposed closed sessions, when applicable. Of the 185 meeting notices received, 32 (17.3 percent) did not provide at least 1 of the required elements. Eighteen political subdivisions could not provide a public meeting notice as requested. Of the tentative agendas that proposed a closed session, 15 did not properly cite the reason for closure.

Meeting Minutes

Full compliance with meeting minutes requirements was measured as providing the date, time, location, and attendance of board members. Of the

201 political subdivisions provided meeting minutes, 74 (36.8 percent) omitted at least 1 required element from the minutes.

Fee Assessment

Of the 309 delivered public record requests, 43 political subdivisions requested payment prior to providing documentation, as allowed by the Sunshine Law. Most fees assessed were in compliance with the law. However, some fees requested to fulfill our requests were not compliant with the Sunshine Law or seemed unreasonable.

Due to the nature of this report, no rating has been provided.

Sunshine Law Review

Table of Contents

State Auditor's Report	2
------------------------	---

Introduction	
Background	3
Scope and Methodology	5

Results	
1. Response Compliance	8
2. Meeting Notices and Agendas	11
3. Meeting Minutes	12
4. Fee Assessment	12

Appendixes		
	<u>Appendix</u>	
A	Public Record Request Letter..... 14	
B	Public Record Request Results..... 15	
C	Schedule of Non-Respondents	25
D	Meeting Minutes and Notices.....	27
E	Custodian of Records	33
F	Recording Policy	40
G	Public Record Request Results - Sorted by County	47



NICOLE GALLOWAY, CPA **Missouri State Auditor**

Honorable Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon, Governor
and
Members of the General Assembly
Jefferson City, Missouri

The State Auditor performed a review of compliance with requests for records under the Sunshine Law, Chapter 610, RSMo. The objectives of the review were to determine if political subdivisions were aware of the responsibilities to provide public records upon request and whether information provided met Sunshine Law requirements. Specific statutory requirements reviewed included:

1. Was a response provided within the allowed time period?
2. Were all records requested received and all questions presented addressed?
3. Were requirements for meeting notices, agendas, and minutes met?
4. Were assessed fees in compliance with Sunshine Law provisions?

We concluded that more than a third of political subdivisions included in our sample, or approximately 1,477 of the 4,113 (35.9 percent) political subdivisions, would not respond to a Sunshine Law request timely. In addition, based on the results of our statistical sample, we estimate 638 of the 4,113 (15.5 percent) political subdivisions would not respond to public record requests. We also estimate 2,686 of the 4,113 (65.3 percent) political subdivisions would not fully comply with public record requests. Some sampled political subdivisions did not respond to, denied, or delayed responses to the requests. By failing to properly and timely respond to requests or denying requests unjustifiably, political subdivisions risk fines, lawsuits, and loss of credibility with their constituency.

The Results section presents comments, findings, and conclusions arising from our Sunshine Law Review.

Nicole R. Galloway, CPA
State Auditor

The following staff participated in the preparation of this report:

Director of Audits:	Regina Pruitt, CPA
Audit Manager:	Corey McComas, M.Acct., CPA
Associate General Counsel:	Yamini Laks
Staff:	Sheila Hohenstreet

Sunshine Law Review

Introduction

Background

Missouri's commitment to openness in government is set in Chapter 610, RSMo. Referred to as the Sunshine Law, the intent of the law is to ensure that public governmental bodies conduct their business in a manner that is open to public scrutiny. It is the policy of the state that meetings, votes, actions, and deliberations of public governmental bodies be open to the public unless otherwise provided by law.

Section 610.010, RSMo, defines public governmental bodies as legislative, administrative, or other governmental political subdivisions created by the constitution or statutes of the state, or by order or ordinance of any political subdivision or district as well as judicial political subdivisions when operating in an administrative capacity. A non-exhaustive list includes state agencies and officials, governing bodies of institutions of higher education, and any department of any political subdivision of the state, county, or municipal government, school district, or special-purpose district, including sewer and water districts.

Section 610.011, RSMo, mandates all public meetings of public governmental bodies shall be open to the public, all public records of public governmental bodies shall be open to the public for inspection and copying, and all public votes of public governmental bodies shall be recorded.

Section 610.020, RSMo, mandates minutes of open and closed meetings shall be taken and retained by the public governmental body, including, but not limited to, a record of any votes taken at such meetings. The minutes shall include the date, time, place, members present, members absent, and a record of any votes taken. In addition, Section 610.020, RSMo, mandates all public governmental bodies shall give notice of the time, date, and place of each meeting, and its tentative agenda, in a manner reasonably expected to advise the public of the matters to be considered. Also, Section 610.020, RSMo, allows for the recording by audiotape, videotape, or other electronic means of any open meeting. A public body may establish guidelines regarding the manner in which such recording is conducted so as to minimize disruption to the meeting. No audio recording of any meeting, record, or vote closed pursuant to the provisions of Section 610.021, RSMo, shall be permitted without permission of the public body.

Section 610.021, RSMo, outlines the reasons permitting meetings of a public governmental body to be closed. These reasons include legal actions, real estate transactions, personnel decisions, state militia, health proceedings, scholastic discipline, testing and exam materials, welfare cases, preparation and discussion of governmental work product, software codes, bidding, proprietary information, municipal hotlines, auditor communications, operational procedures, security systems, computer security, identifiable banking information such as credit card numbers, and records submitted by an individual or private business. Proper citation of the



Sunshine Law Review Introduction

closed meeting must be noticed under Section 610.022.2, RSMo, which states a public governmental body proposing to hold a closed meeting or vote shall give notice of the time, date, and place of such closed meeting or vote and the reason for holding it by reference to the specific statutory section as outlined above.

Section 610.023, RSMo, prescribes that each public governmental body shall make that body's public records available for inspection and copying by the public. Each request for access to a public record shall be acted upon as soon as possible, but in no event later than the end of the third business day following the date the request is received by the custodian of records of a public governmental body. If access to the public record is not granted immediately, the custodian shall give a detailed explanation of the cause for further delay, and the place and earliest time and date that the record will be available for inspection. This period for document production may exceed 3 days for reasonable cause. If a request for access is denied, the custodian shall provide, upon request, a written statement of the grounds for such denial. Such statement shall cite the specific provision of law under which access is denied and shall be furnished to the requester no later than the end of the third business day following the date that the request for the statement is received. If records are requested in a certain format, the public body shall provide the records in the requested format, if such format is available. This section also requires each public governmental body to appoint a custodian who is to be responsible for the maintenance of that body's records. The identity and location of a public governmental body's custodian is to be made available upon request.

Section 610.026, RSMo, allows public governmental bodies to charge fees for providing access to and/or copies of public records and provides requirements related to fees. Prior to producing copies of the requested records, the person requesting the records may request the public governmental body to provide an estimate of the cost. Documents may be furnished without charge or at a reduced charge when the public governmental body determines that waiver or reduction of the fee is in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the public governmental body. Payment of fees may be requested prior to providing copies of public records.

Section 610.027, RSMo, prescribes that any aggrieved person, taxpayer or citizen of, this state, or the attorney general or prosecuting attorney, may seek judicial enforcement of the requirements of the Sunshine Law. Suits to enforce the stated sections shall be brought in the circuit court for the county in which the public governmental body has its principal place of business. Upon a finding by a preponderance of the evidence that a public governmental body or a member of a public governmental body has



Sunshine Law Review Introduction

knowingly violated the Sunshine Law, the public governmental body or the member shall be subject to a civil penalty in an amount up to \$1,000. If there was a knowing violation of the stated sections, the court may order the payment by such body or member of all costs and reasonable attorney fees to any party successfully establishing a violation. Upon a finding by a preponderance of the evidence that a public governmental body or a member of a public governmental body has purposely violated the Sunshine Law, the public governmental body or the member shall be subject to a civil penalty in an amount up to \$5,000. If the court finds that there was a purposeful violation of the Sunshine Law, then the court shall order the payment by such body or member of all costs and reasonable attorney fees to any party successfully establishing such a violation. The court shall determine the amount of the penalty by taking into account the size of the jurisdiction, the seriousness of the offense, and whether the public governmental body or member of a public governmental body has violated the Sunshine Law previously.

Scope and Methodology

Our Sunshine Law review began with the random statistical selection of 326 political subdivisions from the 4,113 political subdivisions maintained in the State Auditor's Office (SAO) database of governmental political subdivisions.¹ To determine the sample size, we used a 95 percent confidence level with an expected error rate of 7 percent. The sample size was selected to obtain a representative statistical sample to determine the number of political subdivisions that are likely to comply with Sunshine Law requirements. The results of selected political subdivisions allowed us to project the number of political subdivisions likely to properly respond to Sunshine Law requests or comply with certain aspects of the Sunshine Law.

To meet the objectives of the review, we sent a letter (see Appendix A) prepared in a manner that resembled a public records request from a private citizen. The letter requested minutes for the last board meeting held in 2015, along with the notice and agenda for that meeting. Political subdivisions were also asked to provide the name and contact information for the custodian of records. In addition, they were asked to respond if the political subdivision had a policy or ordinance regarding recording of public meetings, and, if so, to provide a copy of the policy or ordinance. The request also asked that any fees be waived, but if fees could not be waived, the political subdivision was asked to provide advance notice of any fees that would exceed \$10. We sent initial requests on August 2, 2016, with responses received through September 16, 2016, considered in the evaluation of compliance with the Sunshine Law.

¹ The database consists of all political subdivisions the SAO is aware of. It is possible there are political subdivisions in existence but the SAO has not been notified of their creation or political subdivisions that no longer exist, but the SAO has not been notified of their dissolution.



Sunshine Law Review Introduction

The intent of this review was to evaluate compliance with the Sunshine Law without creating a burdensome or costly request. Requesting recent meeting minutes and notices was to minimize research and duplication time so that no request was for information that would have been archived or voluminous. The intent of requesting custodian of records information was to confirm if this basic requirement of the Sunshine Law was met.

The sample included the following types of political subdivisions and number of each:

Political Subdivision by Type	Number
Cities	47
School Districts	36
Transportation Development Districts	24
Fire Protection Districts	24
Townships	23
Public Water Supply Districts	23
Community Improvement Districts	22
Villages	18
Soil and Water Conservation Districts	16
Library Districts	15
Levee/Drainage Districts	14
Special Road Districts	13
Ambulance Districts	11
Counties	11
Health Departments/Health Centers	9
911 Boards/Emergency Services	4
Sewer Districts	4
Special Business Districts	4
Nursing Home Districts/Adult Care Centers	3
Towns	3
Hospital Districts	2
Total	326

We reviewed the requirements of the Sunshine Law and focused our review on responsiveness and compliance of responses received. Provisions of the Sunshine Law unrelated to our requests were not included in the scope of this review. We applied the following assumptions and criteria in this review:

- There is no distinction between political subdivisions as to size, mission, function, geographic location, and population served regarding the responsibility to respond to requests for records.
- We considered a political subdivision in compliance with Section 610.023.3, RSMo, that requires responses within a certain time period,



Sunshine Law Review Introduction

if it requested clarification of the request, provided documentation, or requested payment prior to delivery of documents within 3 business days of receipt. We determined date of receipt by the political subdivision based on United States Postal Service (USPS) tracking of the certified letter and the response date by the USPS postmark date on the envelope containing the response. Results may have differed had we paid requested fees or considered communications and documents received after September 16, 2016, in the review results.

- We evaluated meeting minutes and notices, including the agendas, for compliance with Sections 610.020.1 and 610.020.7, RSMo, which require documentation of the date, time, and location of the meeting. In addition, we reviewed meeting minutes for a roll call of attendance of board or commission members serving the political subdivision. Also, we reviewed meeting notices to ensure any closed meetings were properly noticed on the meeting agenda as required by Sections 610.021 and 610.022.2, RSMo.
- We considered our request to identify the custodian of records as compliant with Section 610.023.1, RSMo, if the response included the name and contact information of the custodian of records.
- We considered our request regarding the recording policy or ordinance as compliant with Section 610.023, RSMo, if the question was answered "No" and if the entity answered "Yes" and a copy of the policy or ordinance was provided or we were directed to the availability of the policy or ordinance, such as on the entity's website.

A summary of the findings and conclusions reached based upon our review of responses from the sampled political subdivisions have been documented in the Results section. Detailed results by political subdivision are documented in Appendixes B, C, D, E, F, and G.

Sunshine Law Review

Results

1. Response Compliance

We tested to determine whether political subdivisions provided requested records and responded to questions presented in our request letter. The propriety and timeliness of responses are discussed in this finding.

Our review began with assessing compliance with the 3 day rule outlined in the Sunshine Law. Responses were considered noncompliant if no response was received or if a response was not received timely. In addition, overall noncompliance included political subdivisions that did not provide custodian of records information, did not have all required elements included in their meeting notices and agendas, or did not address the question regarding the recording of public meetings.

Of the 326 request letters mailed on August 2, 2016, 309 letters were delivered to the recipient address, while 17 were not confirmed as delivered by the USPS. Of the 309 letters delivered, we received 261 responses. Of the 261 political subdivisions that responded, 201 provided meeting minutes, 185 provided meeting notices, 222 provided the custodian of records information, and 201 provided complete responses to the recording public meetings question. Only 93 respondents (30.1 percent) receiving our request, fully complied with all aspects of it.

Failure to respond

Of the 309 political subdivisions that received the public records request, 48 did not respond at all, for an error rate of 15.5 percent. The political subdivisions that failed to provide any response are identified in Appendix C. Based on these results, an estimated 638 of the 4,113 political subdivisions would not acknowledge or respond to requests for public records.

Untimely response

Of the 261 responses received, 198 responses (75.9 percent) were sent within 3 days. As noted in Appendix B, 63 political subdivisions (24.1 percent) provided responses after the 3 day timeline. While we received the majority of the late responses within a week following the entity's receipt of our request, some responses took more than 20 days to arrive.

Section 610.023.3, RSMo, mandates that each request for access to a public record shall be acted upon as soon as possible, but in no event later than the end of the third business day following the date the request is received by the custodian of records of a public governmental body.

Request denial

Four political subdivisions denied the request unless we responded with clarification of the purpose of the request, provided how the information was to be used, or appeared in person to obtain the documents. These political subdivisions are identified in Appendix B, footnote 4. In addition, 6 political subdivisions required a standard request form be completed. Although the Sunshine Law does not allow completion of a request form to



Sunshine Law Review Results

be required, in 5 of 6 instances we completed and returned required forms in order to obtain requested documentation.

Responses regarding the denial of access received from the political subdivisions included:

- A letter from a Jefferson Township of Grundy County Trustee stated the following:

"More information is needed from you as to the purpose of your request, your belief as to your right to the information, and the eventual use of the proprietary information."

- A letter from Dunklin County stated the following:

"We most certainly honor the statute and look forward to your visit to the Kennett Courthouse Room #201 at your convenience. We only want to insure that these records are in the proper hands."

- A letter from the Village of Cosby stated the following:

". . . we are inquiring as to who we are sending this information to and for what reason. We are a Village of 124 residents and have never been asked to furnish records concerning our monthly meetings, etc. When we officially receive this information from you, we will be glad to send you the records that you requested."

- A letter from the Mineral Springs Special Road District 10 of Barry County stated the following:

"The second and third request I cannot in good consciousness provide you with the information you are seeking due to the lack of information provided about yourself. Sir, I do not know who you are, and I recollect not having had any previous communication with you."

Nothing in the Sunshine Law requires a request to include the purpose or planned use for requesting the documents, provide proof of identity of the requester, or that requests be made using a specified form. None of the political subdivisions denying the request referenced an applicable statute or Sunshine Law provision supporting the reasons for the request denial.

Section 610.022.5, RSMo, mandates public records shall be presumed to be open unless otherwise exempt pursuant to the provisions of this chapter. Our request asked that if any portion of the request was to be denied, that a reason be provided. Section 610.023.4, RSMo, mandates if a request for access is denied, the custodian shall provide, upon request, a written



Sunshine Law Review Results

statement of the grounds for such denial. Such statement shall cite the specific provision of law under which access is denied and shall be furnished to the requester no later than the end of the third business day following the date that the request for the statement is received.

Custodian of records

As noted in Appendix E, 12 political subdivisions did not provide the name and contact information of the custodian of records. This appendix documents all political subdivisions that provided the custodian of records information and documents any entity that provided documentation in response to the our request but omitted the custodian of records information. In addition to these 12 political subdivisions, one respondent stated the custodian position is currently vacant, while another stated the county policy dictates each department is responsible for keeping records so no one person could be identified as the custodian. The reasons provided were not an acceptable reason for not designating a custodian of records and providing that information.

Section 610.023.1, RSMo, states each public governmental body is to appoint a custodian to be responsible for the maintenance of that body's records. The identity and location of a public governmental body's custodian is to be made available upon request.

Recording policy

If a political subdivision receives a public record request or question related to a policy or ordinance, a response must be provided to the requester. Our public record request included a question regarding the existence of a recording policy or ordinance as it relates to public meetings. Compliance with this request, as documented in Appendix F, was determined by first noting if the question was addressed and then if a policy or ordinance was provided if the entity indicated such a document existed. As noted in Appendix F, 16 political subdivisions either did not address the question or did not provide a copy of their policy or ordinance.

Section 610.023, RSMo, states each public governmental body shall make that body's public records available for inspection and copying by the public. If a request for access is denied, the custodian shall provide, upon request, a written statement of the grounds for such denial. Such statement shall cite the specific provision of law under which access is denied. By not responding to the inquiry regarding the recording policy, the political subdivisions were not in compliance with the Sunshine Law.

Conclusion

Political subdivisions should work to understand the requirements for responding to record requests under the Sunshine Law. By not responding to requests properly or timely, political subdivisions subject themselves to lawsuits and fines and risk credibility with their constituency.



2. Meeting Notices and Agendas

For meeting notices and agendas received as a part of our public record requests, we evaluated compliance with meeting notice requirements including the following: (1) time; (2) date; (3) location; (4) tentative agenda; and; (5) proper citation of proposed closed sessions, when applicable. These results are presented in Appendix D. In some cases, political subdivisions did not provide the notice of meeting, and we evaluated whether the reasons were acceptable under the law. An acceptable reason included a responder indicating the notice was not retained; while unacceptable reasons included the responder not providing an explanation for the omission or stating a notice was not required.

Required information

Of the 185 meeting notices received, 32 (17.3 percent) did not provide at least 1 of the required elements identified above, as documented in Appendix D. Section 610.020.1, RSMo, states all public governmental bodies shall give notice of the time, date, and place of each meeting, and its tentative agenda, in a manner reasonably expected to advise the public of the matters to be considered.

Notice not retained

As noted in Appendix D, 18 political subdivisions could not provide a public meeting notice as requested. The reasons for not providing a notice included not retaining the notice or meeting notices not being prepared. In addition, the Reynolds County Public Water Supply District #1 provided the following explanation for the lack of retention: "We do not have a written meeting agenda, nor is there at present an approved board policy. There is also no written meeting notice. These meetings are not public meetings." While the Sunshine Law does not provide a legal requirement to retain the notice, the Secretary of State record retention guidelines state public meeting notice records should be retained for a minimum of 3 years. By retaining meeting notices an entity can document compliance with Sunshine Law public notice requirements and provide additional transparency for government proceedings.

Closed sessions

Of the tentative agendas that proposed a closed session, 15 did not properly cite the reason for closure. We considered a citation proper when it referenced a specific subsection of Section 610.021, RSMo, or other law permitting that the record be closed and not simply a generic reference to the Sunshine Law or listing of all possible sections allowing a meeting could be closed. Section 610.021, RSMo, outlines the reasons permitting meetings of a public body to be closed, and Section 610.022.2, RSMo, states a public governmental body proposing to hold a closed meeting or vote shall give notice of the time, date, and place of such closed meeting or vote and the reason for holding it by reference to the specific exception allowed in Section 610.021, RSMo.

Conclusion

Without providing all required information in a meeting notice, citizens may not be aware of issues that will be discussed at the meeting, where the meeting is located, and when the meeting is held. In addition, by not



Sunshine Law Review Results

retaining meeting notices the political subdivision cannot demonstrate compliance with some Sunshine Law requirements, such as proper documentation of reasons for closed meetings.

3. Meeting Minutes

Full compliance with meeting minutes requirements was measured as providing the date, time, location, and attendance of board members. As noted in Appendix D, of the 201 political subdivisions providing meeting minutes, 74 (36.8 percent) omitted at least 1 required element from the minutes.

Section 610.020.7, RSMo, states minutes of open and closed meetings shall be taken and retained by the public governmental body, including, but not limited to, a record of any votes taken at such meetings. The minutes shall include the date, time, place, members present, members absent, and a record of any votes taken. When a roll call vote is taken, the minutes shall attribute each "yea" and "nay" vote or abstinence if not voting to the name of the individual member of the public governmental body.

Conclusion

Meeting minutes should include all required elements to provide for the transparency in government required by the Sunshine Law. In addition, by not including all elements in minutes the political subdivision cannot demonstrate compliance with some Sunshine Law requirements, such as proper documentation of actions taken by the governmental body.

4. Fee Assessment

Of the 309 delivered public record requests, 43 political subdivisions requested payment prior to providing documentation, as allowed by the Sunshine Law. Most fees assessed were in compliance with the law. However, some fees requested were not compliant with the Sunshine Law or seemed unreasonable.

Violations included improper costs per page; charging a minimum 1 hour of labor for research and copying, regardless of the actual time required; and a standard minimum fee for all Sunshine Law requests. Due to the simplicity of the request (custodian of records name and contact information, minutes, notice and agenda, and recording policy), the expectation was that minimal time could be required to retrieve and copy the documents. Responses included some amounts that seemed unreasonable, with one political subdivision, the Mid-Continent Public Library District, requesting fees in excess of \$80 for the requested documentation.

Section 610.026.1(1), RSMo, allows a public governmental body to charge up to 10 cents per page for standard paper copies, the average hourly rate of pay for clerical staff to duplicate documents, and the actual cost of the research time for fulfilling the request. This provision also requires the public governmental body to produce the requested information using employees capable of searching, researching, and copying the records that



Sunshine Law Review Results

will result in the lowest cost. Fees for accessing records on other media, or non-standard paper copies, shall reflect actual cost involved. The requestor may wish to ask for a breakdown of the costs associated with the request to determine how the public governmental body arrived at the final charge.

Conclusion

Political subdivisions should ensure charges for public record requests comply with the Sunshine Law. Improper or unreasonable charges place an unnecessary burden on a political subdivision's constituents and could result in limited government transparency.

Sunshine Law Review Public Record Request Letter

August 2, 2016

Address

To whom it may concern:

This is a request for records under the Missouri Sunshine Law, Chapter 610, Revised Statutes of Missouri.

I would like to request the following records:

1. The name and contact information for your custodian of records;
2. A copy of your last meeting minutes from 2015 with a copy of the notice and agenda for that meeting;
and
3. Do you have a policy or ordinance on recording public meetings? If yes, please provide a copy.

I request that the documents responsive to this request be mailed to the following address:

P.O. Box 8773
St. Louis, MO 63101

I request that all fees for locating and copying the records be waived. Please let me know in advance of any search or copying fees that will exceed \$10.00.

If portions of the requested records are closed, please cite to the statute that authorizes closure and provide me with the rest of the records.

Thank you for your time.

Sunshine Law Review

Public Record Request Results

This table lists all political subdivisions randomly selected for the Sunshine Law review, and provides results related to compliance with the 3 day rule outlined in the Sunshine Law and overall compliance for all tested Sunshine Law requirements (the 3 day rule and requirements evaluated and presented in the following appendixes). Responses were considered in noncompliance with the 3 day rule if no response was received or if the response was not received timely. Requests we could not confirm as received via USPS tracking were not included in the error rate and were noted as undelivered. If a political subdivision was noncompliant for any applicable reviewed Sunshine Law requirement, it is noted as noncompliant overall.

Legend

N/A - Compliance could not be evaluated

NR - No response received

UD - Undelivered per USPS

Political Subdivision	Response Received Timely?	Met All Applicable Criteria?
Cities		
City of Arkoe	No	No
City of Atlanta	Yes	No
City of Bellflower	Yes	Yes
City of Bloomfield	UD	UD
City of Boonville ¹	Yes	N/A
City of Cassville	Yes	Yes
City of Chula	NR	No
City of Cole Camp ¹	Yes	N/A
City of Crestwood	Yes	Yes
City of East Lynne ¹	No	No
City of East Prairie ¹	Yes	N/A
City of Ethel	Yes	No
City of Excelsior Estates	No	No
City of Freeman	Yes	Yes
City of Grain Valley	Yes	Yes
City of Greenville	Yes	No
City of Hawk Point	Yes	Yes
City of Kingston ¹	Yes	N/A
City of Knob Noster	Yes	No
City of La Plata	Yes	No
City of Ladue	Yes	Yes
City of Lamar	Yes	Yes
City of Lincoln ¹	Yes	N/A
City of Louisiana	No	No
City of Lowry City	NR	No
City of Malden ²	Yes	N/A



Sunshine Law Review
Public Record Request Results

Political Subdivision	Response Received Timely?	Met All Applicable Criteria?
City of Malta Bend ¹	No	No
City of Matthews	Yes	No
City of Memphis	Yes	Yes
City of Middletown ¹	Yes	N/A
City of Montrose	Yes	No
City of Morehouse ¹	Yes	N/A
City of Mountain View ¹	Yes	N/A
City of New Bloomfield	Yes	No
City of New London	Yes	Yes
City of Pleasant Hill	Yes	Yes
City of Prairie Home	No	No
City of Rockville	NR	No
City of Sarcoxie	No	No
City of St. Peters	Yes	Yes
City of Stanberry	Yes	Yes
City of Union Star	Yes	No
City of Urich ¹	Yes	N/A
City of Wellington ¹	Yes	N/A
City of Wentzville	Yes	Yes
City of Westboro ¹	Yes	N/A
City of Wheatland ¹	Yes	N/A
School Districts (SD)		
Appleton City R-II SD ¹	Yes	N/A
Blackwater R-II SD	No	No
Brentwood SD	Yes	Yes
Brunswick R-II SD	Yes	No
Chilhowee R-IV SD	Yes	Yes
Chillicothe R-II SD	No	No
Clark County R-I SD	Yes	Yes
DeSoto 73 SD	Yes	Yes
East Lynne 40 SD	Yes	No
East Prairie R-II SD	Yes	No
Gasconade County R-I SD	Yes	Yes
Hannibal 60 SD ²	No	No
Holcomb R-III SD	Yes	No
Hume R-VIII SD	Yes	No
Kelso C-7 SD	No	No
Kirbyville R-VI SD	No	No
Kirkwood R-VII SD	Yes	No



Sunshine Law Review
Public Record Request Results

Political Subdivision	Response Received Timely?	Met All Applicable Criteria?
Knob Noster R-VIII SD	Yes	Yes
Knox County R-I SD	Yes	Yes
Laclede County C-5 SD	No	No
Laquey R-V SD	Yes	No
Maysville R-I SD	NR	No
Meadow Heights R-II SD	Yes	Yes
Middle Grove C-1 SD	No	No
Missouri City 56 SD	Yes	No
Mountain View-Birch Tree R-III SD	Yes	Yes
New York R-IV SD	NR	No
Plainview R-VIII SD	NR	No
Pleasant Hill R-III SD	No	No
Raymore-Peculiar R-II SD	Yes	No
Republic R-III SD	Yes	No
School of the Osage R-II SD	Yes	Yes
Scotland County R-I SD	Yes	Yes
Stockton R-I SD	Yes	No
Summersville R-II SD	Yes	Yes
Zalma R-V SD	Yes	Yes
Transportation Development Districts (TDD)		
Adams Farm TDD	Yes	No
Belton-Cass Regional TDD	Yes	Yes
City Hospital Laundry Building TDD	UD	UD
Country Club Plaza TDD	Yes	No
Douglas Station TDD	Yes	Yes
East-West Arterial TDD	Yes	No
Ehrhardt Properties TDD	Yes	Yes
Harrisonville Market Place B TDD	No	No
Harrisonville Towne Center TDD	No	No
Horseshoe Bend TDD	Yes	Yes
Kingsmill TDD	UD	UD
Lucas & Hunt/Chandler TDD	Yes	No
Market at McKnight TDD	Yes	Yes
Mexico Road TDD	Yes	Yes
Northwoods TDD ⁹	No	No
Olive Boulevard TDD	Yes	Yes
Rock Bridge Center TDD	No	No
Southtown TDD ⁸	Yes	N/A
St. Cyr Road TDD	Yes	Yes



Sunshine Law Review
Public Record Request Results

Political Subdivision	Response Received Timely?	Met All Applicable Criteria?
St. John Crossings TDD	Yes	Yes
Stadium Corridor TDD	Yes	Yes
Tracy Highlands TDD	UD	UD
Village of Green Hills TDD ³	Yes	No
Wentzville Parkway I TDD	NR	No
Fire Protection Districts (FPD)		
Antonia FPD ¹	Yes	N/A
Armstrong FPD	Yes	No
Augusta FPD	UD	UD
Carl Junction FPD	NR	No
Cedar Hill FPD ¹	Yes	N/A
Cole County FPD	UD	UD
Dadeville Rural FPD	Yes	No
Elm Township FPD	Yes	Yes
Higbee FPD	NR	No
Mercer County FPD	No	No
Monroe City Area FPD	No	No
Morrisville FPD	Yes	Yes
Mound City Rural FPD ¹	Yes	N/A
North Callaway FPD	Yes	No
Pettis County FPD 1	NR	No
Pleasant Hill FPD	Yes	Yes
Rivers Pointe FPD	NR	No
Rosendale FPD	No	No
South Callaway FPD ¹	Yes	N/A
Steelville FPD	Yes	Yes
Strafford FPD ¹	Yes	N/A
Tri-County FPD	Yes	No
Versailles FPD 4	No	No
West Peculiar FPD	No	No
Townships		
Bogard Township of Henry County ¹	Yes	N/A
Bowling Green Township of Chariton County	Yes	No
Charlotte Township of Bates County	NR	No
Clay Township of Harrison County	NR	No
Duck Creek Township of Stoddard County	NR	No
Enterprise Township of Linn County	NR	No
Freeborn Township of Dunklin County	No	No
Grand River Township of Bates County	NR	No



Sunshine Law Review
Public Record Request Results

Political Subdivision	Response Received Timely?	Met All Applicable Criteria?
Jackson Township of Linn County	Yes	No
Jefferson Township of Grundy County ⁴	No	No
Liberty Township of Grundy County	NR	No
Liberty Township of Putnam County	NR	No
Liberty Township of Stoddard County	No	No
Marion Township of Harrison County ¹	Yes	N/A
Moundville Township of Vernon County	NR	No
Myers Township of Grundy County	No	No
Osage Township of Bates County	NR	No
Piney Township of Texas County	No	No
Prairie Township of Carroll County	NR	No
Sherman Township of DeKalb County	UD	UD
Upton Township of Texas County	No	No
West Point Township of Bates County	NR	No
White Oak Township of Harrison County ¹	Yes	N/A
Public Water Supply Districts (PWSD)		
PWSD 1 of Camden County ⁵	No	No
PWSD 1 of Cedar County	NR	No
PWSD 1 of DeKalb County	Yes	Yes
PWSD 1 of Gentry County ¹	Yes	N/A
PWSD 1 of Mercer County	NR	No
PWSD 1 of Newton County	Yes	Yes
PWSD 1 of Ray County ¹	Yes	N/A
PWSD 1 of Reynolds County	Yes	No
PWSD 1 of Scott County	NR	No
PWSD 2 of Andrew County	Yes	Yes
PWSD 2 of Caldwell County ¹	Yes	N/A
PWSD 2 of Camden County	Yes	No
PWSD 2 of St. Charles County	Yes	No
PWSD 2 of Wayne County	No	No
PWSD 3 of Cass County	UD	UD
PWSD 4 of Cape Girardeau County	No	No
PWSD 4 of Henry County ¹	Yes	N/A
PWSD 4 of Texas County	Yes	No
PWSD 7 of Bates County	No	No
PWSD 7 of Clay County ¹	No	No
PWSD 8 of Cass County ⁹	Yes	Yes
PWSD 8 of Platte County	Yes	No
Thomas Hill PWSD 1 of Randolph County	Yes	Yes



Sunshine Law Review
Public Record Request Results

Political Subdivision	Response Received Timely?	Met All Applicable Criteria?
Community Improvement Districts (CID)		
1100 Washington Avenue CID ¹	No	No
BaratHaven CID	Yes	Yes
Blue Parkway and Colbern Road CID	Yes	Yes
Brentwood Blvd/Clayton Rd CID	Yes	Yes
Briarbrook CID	NR	No
Brighton Creek Commons CID	Yes	Yes
College Station CID	Yes	No
Crestwood Market CID	Yes	Yes
Crossroads Shopping Center CID	Yes	Yes
East Hills CID	Yes	No
Eastern Hills CID ¹	Yes	N/A
Eureka South I-44 CID ⁶	Yes	N/A
I-470 CID	Yes	Yes
KCI/I-29 CID ⁶	Yes	N/A
Mountain Farm CID	Yes	No
Peachtree CID	NR	No
Phoenix Center II CID	Yes	Yes
Railway Exchange Building CID ¹	No	No
Stateline CID	Yes	Yes
Sullivan Marketplace CID	UD	UD
The Fountains CID	Yes	Yes
Viking Conference Center CID	Yes	Yes
Villages		
Arrow Point Village, Inc.	NR	No
Village of Agency	Yes	Yes
Village of Arcola	NR	No
Village of Cosby ⁴	Yes	No
Village of Hoberg	NR	No
Village of Lamar Heights	No	No
Village of Loch Lloyd	Yes	No
Village of Moundville	Yes	No
Village of Powersville	NR	No
Village of Reeds	NR	No
Village of River Bend	UD	UD
Village of Rushville	No	No
Village of Sibley	Yes	No
Village of South Greenfield	Yes	Yes
Village of Tightwad	NR	No



Sunshine Law Review
Public Record Request Results

Political Subdivision	Response Received Timely?	Met All Applicable Criteria?
Village of Utica	No	No
Village of Weatherby	No	No
Village of Whitewater	NR	No
Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCD)		
Andrew County SWCD	Yes	Yes
Audrain County SWCD	No	No
Barry County SWCD	Yes	Yes
Camden County SWCD	Yes	No
Carroll County SWCD	NR	No
Carter County SWCD	Yes	Yes
Cooper County SWCD	Yes	Yes
Franklin County SWCD	Yes	Yes
Howard County SWCD	Yes	Yes
Livingston County SWCD ¹	Yes	N/A
Maries County SWCD	Yes	Yes
Mississippi County SWCD	UD	UD
Monroe County SWCD	Yes	Yes
St. Francois County SWCD	Yes	Yes
Ste. Genevieve County SWCD	Yes	Yes
Worth County SWCD ¹	Yes	N/A
Library Districts (LD)		
Carthage Public LD	No	No
Christian County LD	No	No
Gentry County LD	Yes	No
Hannibal Free Public LD	Yes	Yes
Knox County LD	Yes	Yes
Livingston County Memorial LD	Yes	No
Louisiana Public LD	NR	No
Mercer County LD	No	No
Mid-Continent Public LD	Yes	No
Norborne Public LD	NR	No
Rolling Hills Consolidated LD	No	No
Scotland County LD	No	No
Scott County LD	No	No
St. Clair County LD	Yes	No
Wright County LD	No	No
Levee/Drainage Districts		
Benton Township & Rock Creek Drainage District	Yes	Yes
Big Creek - Hurricane Creek Watershed Subdistrict ¹	No	No



Sunshine Law Review
Public Record Request Results

Political Subdivision	Response Received Timely?	Met All Applicable Criteria?
Bois Brule Levee & Drainage District of Perry County	No	No
Bonne Femme Levee District 1 ⁷	Yes	N/A
Consolidated Drainage District 2 of Dunklin County	NR	No
Districts 1-7-13 & 33-14-17-19 of Stoddard County	UD	UD
Drainage District 28 of Stoddard County	No	No
Elk Chute Drainage District	No	No
Halls Levee District of Buchanan County	No	No
Lake Drainage District 1 of Osage County	NR	No
Levee District 2 of Ray County	Yes	Yes
Levee District 9 of Holt County ¹	Yes	N/A
North Inter-River Drainage District	NR	No
Sugartree Drainage District	No	No
Special Road Districts (SRD)		
Bigelow Independent SRD of Holt County ¹	Yes	N/A
Buck Prairie SRD of Lawrence County	Yes	No
City of Crystal Lakes SRD ¹	Yes	N/A
Flemington SRD of Polk County	Yes	Yes
Greasy Creek SRD 35 of Barry County	Yes	Yes
Hillsboro SRD of Jefferson County	Yes	No
Jenkins SRD 20 of Barry County	UD	UD
Laclede County SRD	Yes	No
Mineral Springs SRD 10 of Barry County ⁴	No	No
Ozark SRD of Barry County	UD	UD
Spickard SRD	No	No
Wellsville SRD of Montgomery County	Yes	Yes
Wolfe Creek SRD of Ripley County	Yes	No
Ambulance Districts (AD)		
Chariton County AD	Yes	No
Clearwater AD	NR	No
Dade County AD	Yes	No
Grand River Regional AD	Yes	Yes
Iron County AD	Yes	No
Knox County AD	Yes	Yes
Mountain View-Summersville AD	No	No
Reynolds County AD	UD	UD
Saline County AD 3	Yes	No
Taney County AD	No	No
Van-Far AD	Yes	No



Sunshine Law Review
Public Record Request Results

Political Subdivision	Response Received Timely?	Met All Applicable Criteria?
Counties		
Adair County	Yes	Yes
Camden County	NR	No
Dunklin County ⁴	Yes	No
Franklin County	Yes	Yes
Greene County	NR	No
Lawrence County	Yes	No
Lincoln County	NR	No
Miller County	Yes	No
Mississippi County	Yes	No
Scotland County	Yes	Yes
Warren County	Yes	No
Health Departments/Health Centers		
Cape Girardeau County Public Health Department ¹	Yes	N/A
Hickory County Health Department	Yes	No
Madison County Health Department	Yes	Yes
Mercer County Health Department	Yes	Yes
Moniteau County Health Center	Yes	Yes
Montgomery County Health Department ¹	Yes	N/A
Morgan County Health Center	NR	No
Nodaway County Health Center	Yes	Yes
Pike County Health Department ¹	Yes	N/A
911 Boards/Emergency Services		
Chariton County 911 Board	Yes	Yes
Jasper County Emergency Services	Yes	Yes
Jefferson County 911 Board	Yes	Yes
Saline County 911 Board ¹	Yes	N/A
Sewer Districts		
Camelot Sewer District ¹	Yes	N/A
Lake Adelle Sewer District	UD	UD
Missouri River-Bonfils Sewer District	NR	No
South St. Joseph Industrial Sewer District	NR	No
Special Business Districts (SBD)		
Bi-State Commission SBD	Yes	Yes
Cape Girardeau SBD ⁹	Yes	Yes
Clayton SBD	Yes	Yes
Kirkwood SBD	Yes	Yes
Nursing Home Districts/Adult Care Centers		
Golden Age Nursing Home District 1	No	No



Sunshine Law Review
Public Record Request Results

Political Subdivision	Response Received Timely?	Met All Applicable Criteria?
Marion County Nursing Home District	NR	No
Twin Pines Adult Care Center	Yes	Yes
Towns		
Town of Allenville	UD	UD
Town of Augusta	No	No
Town of Harrisburg	Yes	No
Hospital Districts		
New Liberty Hospital District ¹	No	No
Ripley County Memorial Hospital District	No	No
Summary of Results		
Total responses meeting statute (Yes)	198	93
Total responses not meeting statute (No)	63	175
Did not respond (NR)	48	0
Not applicable (N/A)	0	41
Request letter undelivered (UD)	17	17
Total	326	326
Error percentage	35.9%	65.3%

¹ The political subdivisions requested payment prior to providing requested documentation, which is permitted by the Sunshine Law. For these political subdivisions, we were only able to evaluate a timely response to the initial inquiry. If the entity provided a response to either the custodian or recording policy request it will be included in Appendix E or F, respectively. Because we did not submit the requested fee when entities asked for prepayment, political subdivisions that responded timely are not evaluated for overall compliance since all criteria could not be reviewed. For political subdivisions that requested payment, but did not respond timely, overall compliance has been indicated as "No."

² The political subdivisions requested clarification prior to providing requested documentation, which is permitted by the Sunshine Law. For these political subdivisions, we were only able to evaluate a timely response to the initial inquiry. If the entity provided a response to either the custodian or recording policy request it will be included in Appendix E or F, respectively. Because we did respond to clarification questions, political subdivisions that responded timely are not evaluated for overall compliance since all criteria could not be reviewed. For political subdivisions that requested clarification, but did not respond timely, overall compliance has been indicated as "No."

³ This political subdivision was established in 2016 while our request was for documentation of meeting minutes and notices from 2015. Minutes and notices were not evaluated in Appendix D, however, compliance has been evaluated for the custodian of records and the recording policy in Appendixes E and F, respectively. Overall compliance is evaluated based on the applicable criteria.

⁴ These political subdivisions denied our public records request without further knowledge of who made the request or why the request was made, or required the requestor to appear in person. Such restrictions to public record access are not permitted by the Sunshine Law.

⁵ This political subdivision sent a letter stating we should expect documentation to be received at a later date. We did not receive a subsequent response with the requested items.

⁶ These political subdivisions dissolved prior to the public records request being made. Minimal information could be provided due to the entity being dissolved.

⁷ The individual who responded for this political subdivision indicated the request had been forwarded to the custodian of records. We could not verify if that occurred, thus no further compliance has been evaluated.

⁸ This political subdivision requested a form to be filled out in order to obtain documentation. Because we did not submit the requested form the political subdivision was not evaluated for overall compliance.

⁹ These political subdivisions will not appear on Appendix D since they did not conduct any meetings in 2015. They were only evaluated for timeliness of response, custodian of records, and whether they addressed the recording policy question.

Sunshine Law Review

Schedule of Non-Respondents

This listing documents the 48 entities that did not respond to the public records requests. The listing is as of September 16, 2016, 6 weeks after we mailed the initial requests for records.

Non-Respondent Entities

Cities

City of Chula
City of Lowry City
City of Rockville

School Districts (SD)

Maysville R-I SD
New York R-IV SD
Plainview R-VIII SD

Transportation Development Districts (TDD)

Wentzville Parkway I TDD

Fire Protection Districts (FPD)

Carl Junction FPD
Higbee FPD
Pettis County 1 FPD
Rivers Pointe FPD

Townships

Charlotte Township of Bates County
Clay Township of Harrison County
Duck Creek Township of Stoddard County
Enterprise Township of Linn County
Grand River Township of Bates County
Liberty Township of Grundy County
Liberty Township of Putnam County
Moundville Township of Vernon County
Osage Township of Bates County
Prairie Township of Carroll County
West Point Township of Bates County

Public Water Supply Districts (PWSD)

PWSD 1 of Cedar County
PWSD 1 of Mercer County
PWSD 1 of Scott County

Community Improvement Districts (CID)

Briarbrook CID
Peachtree CID



Sunshine Law Review
Schedule of Non-Respondents

Non-Respondent Entities

Villages

Arrow Point Village, Inc.
Village of Arcola
Village of Hoberg
Village of Powersville
Village of Reeds
Village of Tightwad
Village of Whitewater

Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCD)

Carroll County SWCD

Library Districts (LD)

Louisiana Public LD
Norborne Public LD

Levee/Drainage Districts

Consolidated Drainage District 2 of Dunklin County
Lake Drainage District 1 of Osage County
North Inter-River Drainage District

Ambulance Districts (AD)

Clearwater AD

Counties

Camden County
Greene County
Lincoln County

Health Departments/Health Centers

Morgan County Health Center

Sewer Districts (SD)

Missouri River-Bonfils Sewer District
South St. Joseph Industrial Sewer District

Nursing Home Districts/Adult Care Centers

Marion County Nursing Home District

Sunshine Law Review

Meeting Minutes and Notices

This schedule first indicates if a political subdivision provided meeting minutes and notice of the meeting as requested. If so, the minutes and notice were evaluated for inclusion of all statutorily required elements. If the documents were not received and a reason provided, the reason was evaluated as acceptable or unacceptable. Acceptable reasons include a notice not being retained because there is no Sunshine Law requirement to retain notices or no meeting was conducted during the requested time period, while an unacceptable reason could include that the political subdivision indicated it does not prepare meeting notices.

Legend

N¹ - Not Provided for an Acceptable Reason

N² - Not Provided for an Unacceptable Reason

N/A - Not Applicable

Political Subdivision	Minutes Provided?	Notice of Meeting Provided?	Minutes Include Required Elements?	Notice Includes Required Elements?
Cities				
City of Arkoe	Yes	N ²	No	N/A
City of Atlanta	Yes	Yes	No	No
City of Bellflower	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Cassville	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Crestwood	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Ethel	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
City of Excelsior Estates	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Freeman	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Grain Valley	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Greenville	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
City of Hawk Point	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Knob Noster	Yes	Yes	No	No
City of Ladue	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Lamar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of La Plata	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
City of Louisiana	Yes	Yes	No	No
City of Matthews	Yes	Yes	No	No
City of Memphis	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Montrose	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
City of New Bloomfield	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
City of New London	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Pleasant Hill	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Prairie Home	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Sarcoxie	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Stanberry	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of St. Peters	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Union Star	Yes	Yes	No	No
City of Wentzville	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
School Districts (SD)				
Blackwater R-II SD	Yes	Yes	No	No
Brentwood SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Brunswick R-II SD	Yes	N ²	Yes	N/A
Chilhowee R-IV SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes



Sunshine Law Review
Meeting Minutes and Notices

Political Subdivision	Minutes Provided?	Notice of Meeting Provided?	Minutes Included Required Elements?	Notice Included Required Elements?
Chillicothe R-II SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Clark County R-I SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
DeSoto 73 SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
East Lynne 40 SD	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
East Prairie R-II SD	Yes	Yes	No	No
Gasconade County R-I SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Holcomb R-III SD	Yes	Yes	No	No
Hume R-VIII SD	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Kelso C-7 SD	N ²	Yes	N/A	Yes
Kirbyville R-VI SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Kirkwood R-VII SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Knob Noster R-VIII SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Knox County R-I SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Laclede County C-5 SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Laquey R-V SD	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Meadow Heights R-II SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Middle Grove C-1 SD	Yes	Yes	No	No
Missouri City 56 SD	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Mountain View-Birch Tree R-III SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Pleasant Hill R-III SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Raymore-Peculiar R-II SD	Yes	N ²	Yes	N/A
Republic R-III SD	Yes	Yes	No	No
School of the Osage R-II SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Scotland County R-I SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Stockton R-I SD	Yes	Yes	No	No
Summersville R-II SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Zalma R-V SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Transportation Development Districts (TDD)				
Adams Farm TDD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Belton-Cass Regional TDD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country Club Plaza TDD	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Douglas Station TDD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
East-West Arterial TDD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ehrhardt Properties TDD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Harrisonville Market Place B TDD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Harrisonville Towne Center TDD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Horseshoe Bend TDD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lucas & Hunt/Chandler TDD	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Market at McKnight TDD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mexico Road TDD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Olive Boulevard TDD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rock Bridge Center TDD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Stadium Corridor TDD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes



Sunshine Law Review
Meeting Minutes and Notices

Political Subdivision	Minutes Provided?	Notice of Meeting Provided?	Minutes Included Required Elements?	Notice Included Required Elements?
St. Cyr Road TDD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
St. John Crossings TDD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Fire Protection Districts (FPD)				
Armstrong FPD	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Dadeville Rural FPD	Yes	N ¹	No	N/A
Elm Township FPD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mercer County FPD	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Monroe City Area FPD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Morrisville FPD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
North Callaway FPD	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Pleasant Hill FPD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rosendale FPD	Yes	N ¹	No	N/A
Steelville FPD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tri-County FPD	Yes	Yes	No	No
Versailles FPD 4	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
West Peculiar FPD	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Townships				
Bowling Green Township of Chariton County	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Freeborn Township of Dunklin County	Yes	N ²	No	N/A
Jackson Township of Linn County	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Liberty Township of Stoddard County	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Myers Township of Grundy County	Yes	N ²	No	N/A
Piney Township of Texas County	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Upton Township of Texas County	Yes	Yes	No	No
Public Water Supply Districts (PWSB)				
PWSB 1 of DeKalb County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
PWSB 1 of Newton County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
PWSB 1 of Reynolds County	Yes	N ²	No	N/A
PWSB 2 of Andrew County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
PWSB 2 of Camden County	Yes	Yes	No	No
PWSB 2 of St. Charles County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
PWSB 2 of Wayne County	Yes	Yes	No	No
PWSB 4 of Cape Girardeau County	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
PWSB 4 of Texas County	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
PWSB 7 of Bates County	Yes	N ²	No	N/A
PWSB 8 of Platte County	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Thomas Hill PWSB 1 of Randolph County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Community Improvement Districts (CID)				
I-470 CID	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BaratHaven CID	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Blue Parkway and Colbern Road CID	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Brentwood Blvd/Clayton Rd CID	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Brighton Creek Commons CID	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes



Sunshine Law Review
Meeting Minutes and Notices

Political Subdivision	Minutes Provided?	Notice of Meeting Provided?	Minutes Included Required Elements?	Notice Included Required Elements?
College Station CID	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Crestwood Market CID	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Crossroads Shopping Center CID	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
East Hills CID	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Mountain Farm CID	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Phoenix Center II CID	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Stateline CID	N ¹	Yes	N/A	Yes
The Fountains CID	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Viking Conference Center CID	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Villages				
Village of Agency	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Village of Lamar Heights	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Village of Loch Lloyd	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Village of Moundville	Yes	N ¹	No	N/A
Village of Rushville	Yes	Yes	No	No
Village of Sibley	Yes	Yes	No	No
Village of South Greenfield	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Village of Utica	Yes	Yes	No	No
Village of Weatherby	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCD)				
Andrew County SWCD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Audrain County SWCD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Barry County SWCD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Camden County SWCD	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Carter County SWCD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cooper County SWCD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Franklin County SWCD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Howard County SWCD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maries County SWCD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Monroe County SWCD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
St. Francois County SWCD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ste. Genevieve County SWCD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Library Districts (LD)				
Carthage Public LD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Christian County LD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Gentry County LD	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Hannibal Free Public LD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Knox County LD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Livingston County Memorial LD	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Mercer County LD	Yes	N ²	Yes	N/A
Mid-Continent Public LD	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Rolling Hills Consolidated LD	Yes	N ²	Yes	N/A
St. Clair County LD	Yes	Yes	No	No



Sunshine Law Review
Meeting Minutes and Notices

Political Subdivision	Minutes Provided?	Notice of Meeting Provided?	Minutes Included Required Elements?	Notice Included Required Elements?
Scotland County LD	Yes	Yes	No	No
Scott County LD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wright County LD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Levee/Drainage Districts				
Benton Township & Rock Creek Drainage District	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bois Brule Levee & Drainage District of Perry County	Yes	N ²	No	N/A
Drainage District 28 of Stoddard County	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Elk Chute Drainage District	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Halls Levee District of Buchanan County	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Levee District 2 of Ray County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sugartree Drainage District	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Special Road Districts (SRD)				
Buck Prairie SRD of Lawrence County	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Flemington SRD of Polk County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greasy Creek SRD 35 of Barry County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hillsboro SRD of Jefferson County	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Laclede County SRD	Yes	N ¹	No	N/A
Spickard SRD	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Wellsville SRD of Montgomery County	Yes	N ¹	Yes	N/A
Wolfe Creek SRD of Ripley County	Yes	N ²	Yes	N/A
Ambulance Districts (AD)				
Chariton County AD	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Dade County AD	Yes	N ¹	No	N/A
Grand River Regional AD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Iron County AD	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Knox County AD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mountain View-Summersville AD	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Saline County AD 3	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Taney County AD	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Van-Far AD	Yes	Yes	No	No
Counties				
Adair County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Franklin County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lawrence County	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Miller County	Yes	Yes	No	No
Mississippi County	Yes	N ₁	No	N/A
Scotland County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Warren County	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Health Departments/Health Centers				
Hickory County Health Department	Yes	Yes	No	No
Madison County Health Department	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mercer County Health Department	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Moniteau County Health Center	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes



Sunshine Law Review
Meeting Minutes and Notices

Political Subdivision	Minutes Provided?	Notice of Meeting Provided?	Minutes Included Required Elements?	Notice Included Required Elements?
Nodaway County Health Center	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
911 Boards/Emergency Services				
Chariton County 911 Board	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Jasper County Emergency Services	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Jefferson County 911 Board	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Special Business Districts (SBD)				
Bi-State Commission SBD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Clayton SBD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Kirkwood SBD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Nursing Home Districts/Adult Care Centers				
Golden Age Nursing Home District 1	Yes	Yes	No	No
Twin Pines Adult Care Center	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Towns				
Town of Augusta	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Town of Harrisburg	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Hospital Districts				
Ripley County Memorial Hospital District	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Summary of Results				
Total responses received or meeting statute (Yes)	201	185	127	153
Total responses received not meeting statute (No)	0	0	74	32
Response not received for an acceptable reason (N ¹)	1	7	N/A	N/A
Response not received for an unacceptable reason (N ²)	1	11	N/A	N/A
Total	203	203	201	185
Error percentage	0.5%	5.4%	36.8%	17.3%

Sunshine Law Review

Custodian of Records

For each political subdivision we mailed a public record request asking for the name and contact information of the custodian of records. Political subdivisions providing the custodian of records information and those providing all other requested items except the custodian of records information are included in this appendix. "Yes" indicates custodian of records information was provided. "No" indicates custodian of records information was not provided; however, other request information was provided and is evaluated elsewhere in the report.

Political Subdivision	Custodian of Records Identified?
Cities	
City of Arkoe	Yes
City of Atlanta	Yes
City of Bellflower	Yes
City of Boonville	Yes
City of Cassville	Yes
City of Crestwood	Yes
City of East Lynne	Yes
City of Ethel	Yes
City of Excelsior Estates	Yes
City of Freeman	Yes
City of Grain Valley	Yes
City of Greenville	Yes
City of Hawk Point	Yes
City of Kingston	Yes
City of Knob Noster	Yes
City of La Plata	Yes
City of Ladue	Yes
City of Lamar	Yes
City of Louisiana	Yes
City of Malden	Yes
City of Matthews	Yes
City of Memphis	Yes
City of Montrose	Yes
City of New Bloomfield	Yes
City of New London	Yes
City of Pleasant Hill	Yes
City of Prairie Home	Yes
City of Sarcoxie	Yes
City of St. Peters	Yes
City of Stanberry	Yes
City of Union Star	Yes
City of Urich	Yes
City of Wellington	Yes



Sunshine Law Review
Custodian of Records

Political Subdivision	Custodian of Records Identified?
City of Wentzville	Yes
City of Westboro	Yes
School Districts (SD)	
Appleton City R-II SD	Yes
Blackwater R-II SD	Yes
Brentwood SD	Yes
Brunswick R-II SD	Yes
Chilhowee R-IV SD	Yes
Chillicothe R-II SD	Yes
Clark County R-I SD	Yes
DeSoto 73 SD	Yes
East Lynne 40 SD	Yes
East Prairie R-II SD	Yes
Gasconade County R-I SD	Yes
Hannibal 60 SD	Yes
Holcomb R-III SD	Yes
Hume R-VIII SD	Yes
Kelso C-7 SD	No
Kirbyville R-VI SD	Yes
Kirkwood R-VII SD	No
Knob Noster R-VIII SD	Yes
Knox County R-I SD	Yes
Laclede County C-5 SD	Yes
Laquey R-V SD	Yes
Meadow Heights R-II SD	Yes
Middle Grove C-1 SD	Yes
Missouri City 56 SD	Yes
Mountain View-Birch Tree R-III SD	Yes
Pleasant Hill R-III SD	Yes
Raymore-Peculiar R-II SD	Yes
Republic R-III SD	Yes
School of the Osage R-II SD	Yes
Scotland County R-I SD	Yes
Stockton R-I SD	Yes
Summersville R-II SD	Yes
Zalma R-V SD	Yes
Transportation Development Districts (TDD)	
Adams Farm TDD	No
Belton-Cass Regional TDD	Yes



Sunshine Law Review
Custodian of Records

Political Subdivision	Custodian of Records Identified?
Country Club Plaza TDD	Yes
Douglas Station TDD	Yes
East-West Arterial TDD	Yes
Ehrhardt Properties TDD	Yes
Harrisonville Market Place B TDD	Yes
Harrisonville Towne Center TDD	Yes
Horseshoe Bend TDD	Yes
Lucas & Hunt/Chandler TDD	Yes
Market at McKnight TDD	Yes
Mexico Road TDD	Yes
Northwoods TDD	Yes
Olive Boulevard TDD	Yes
Rock Bridge Center TDD	Yes
Southtown TDD	Yes
St. Cyr Road TDD	Yes
St. John Crossings TDD	Yes
Stadium Corridor TDD	Yes
Village of Green Hills TDD	Yes
Fire Protection Districts (FPD)	
Antonia FPD	Yes
Armstrong FPD	Yes
Cedar Hill FPD	Yes
Dadeville Rural FPD	Yes
Elm Township FPD	Yes
Mercer County FPD	No
Monroe City Area FPD	Yes
Morrisville FPD	Yes
North Callaway FPD	Yes
Pleasant Hill FPD	Yes
Rosendale FPD	Yes
South Callaway FPD	Yes
Steelville FPD	Yes
Tri-County FPD	Yes
Versailles FPD 4	Yes
West Peculiar FPD	Yes
Townships	
Bogard Township of Henry County	Yes
Bowling Green Township of Chariton County	Yes
Freeborn Township of Dunklin County	Yes
Jackson Township of Linn County	Yes



Sunshine Law Review
Custodian of Records

Political Subdivision	Custodian of Records Identified?
Liberty Township of Stoddard County	Yes
Myers Township of Grundy County	Yes
Piney Township of Texas County	Yes
Upton Township of Texas County	Yes
Public Water Supply Districts (PWSD)	
PWSD 1 of DeKalb County	Yes
PWSD 1 of Gentry County	Yes
PWSD 1 of Newton County	Yes
PWSD 1 of Reynolds County	Yes
PWSD 2 of Andrew County	Yes
PWSD 2 of Caldwell County	Yes
PWSD 2 of Camden County	Yes
PWSD 2 of St. Charles County	No
PWSD 2 of Wayne County	Yes
PWSD 4 of Cape Girardeau County	Yes
PWSD 4 of Henry County	Yes
PWSD 4 of Texas County	Yes
PWSD 7 of Bates County	Yes
PWSD 7 of Clay County	Yes
PWSD 8 of Cass County	Yes
PWSD 8 of Platte County	Yes
Thomas Hill PWSD 1 of Randolph County	Yes
Community Improvement Districts (CID)	
BaratHaven CID	Yes
Blue Parkway and Colbern Road CID	Yes
Brentwood Blvd/Clayton Rd CID	Yes
Brighton Creek Commons CID	Yes
College Station CID	Yes
Crestwood Market CID	Yes
Crossroads Shopping Center CID	Yes
East Hills CID	Yes
Eastern Hills CID	Yes
Eureka South I-44 CID	Yes
I-470 CID	Yes
Mountain Farm CID	Yes
Phoenix Center II CID	Yes
Railway Exchange Building CID	Yes
Stateline CID	Yes
The Fountains CID	Yes
Viking Conference Center CID	Yes
Villages	
Village of Agency	Yes



Sunshine Law Review
Custodian of Records

Political Subdivision	Custodian of Records Identified?
Village of Lamar Heights	Yes
Village of Loch Lloyd	Yes
Village of Moundville	Yes
Village of Rushville	Yes
Village of Sibley	No
Village of South Greenfield	Yes
Village of Utica	No
Village of Weatherby	Yes
Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCD)	
Andrew County SWCD	Yes
Audrain County SWCD	Yes
Barry County SWCD	Yes
Camden County SWCD	Yes
Carter County SWCD	Yes
Cooper County SWCD	Yes
Franklin County SWCD	Yes
Howard County SWCD	Yes
Maries County SWCD	Yes
Monroe County SWCD	Yes
St. Francois County SWCD	Yes
Ste. Genevieve County SWCD	Yes
Worth County SWCD	Yes
Library Districts (LD)	
Carthage Public LD	Yes
Christian County LD	Yes
Gentry County LD	Yes
Hannibal Free Public LD	Yes
Knox County LD	Yes
Livingston County Memorial LD	Yes
Mercer County LD	Yes
Mid-Continent Public LD	Yes
Rolling Hills Consolidated LD	Yes
Scotland County LD	Yes
Scott County LD	No
St. Clair County LD	Yes
Wright County LD	Yes
Levee/Drainage Districts	
Benton Township & Rock Creek Drainage District	Yes
Bois Brule Levee & Drainage District of Perry County	Yes
Drainage District 28 of Stoddard County	Yes



Sunshine Law Review
Custodian of Records

Political Subdivision	Custodian of Records Identified?
Elk Chute Drainage District	Yes
Halls Levee District of Buchanan County	Yes
Levee District 2 of Ray County	Yes
Sugartree Drainage District	Yes
Special Road Districts (SRD)	
Buck Prairie SRD of Lawrence County	Yes
City of Crystal Lakes SRD	Yes
Flemington SRD of Polk County	Yes
Greasy Creek SRD 35 of Barry County	Yes
Hillsboro SRD of Jefferson County	Yes
Mineral Springs SRD 10 of Barry County	Yes
Spickard SRD	Yes
Wellsville SRD of Montgomery County	Yes
Wolfe Creek SRD of Ripley County	Yes
Ambulance Districts (AD)	
Chariton County AD	Yes
Dade County AD	Yes
Grand River Regional AD	Yes
Iron County AD	Yes
Knox County AD	Yes
Mountain View-Summersville AD	No
Saline County AD 3	Yes
Taney County AD	Yes
Van-Far AD	Yes
Counties	
Adair County	Yes
Franklin County	Yes
Lawrence County	No
Miller County	Yes
Mississippi County	No
Scotland County	Yes
Warren County	Yes
Health Departments/Health Centers	
Cape Girardeau County Public Health Department	Yes
Hickory County Health Department	Yes
Madison County Health Department	Yes
Mercer County Health Department	Yes
Moniteau County Health Center	Yes
Nodaway County Health Center	Yes
Pike County Health Department	Yes



Sunshine Law Review
Custodian of Records

Political Subdivision	Custodian of Records Identified?
911 Boards/Emergency Services	
Chariton County 911 Board	Yes
Jasper County Emergency Services	Yes
Jefferson County 911 Board	Yes
Saline County 911 Board	Yes
Sewer Districts	
Camelot Sewer District	Yes
Special Business Districts (SBD)	
Bi-State Commission SBD	Yes
Cape Girardeau SBD	Yes
Clayton SBD	Yes
Kirkwood SBD	Yes
Nursing Home Districts/Adult Care Centers	
Golden Age Nursing Home District 1	Yes
Twin Pines Adult Care Center	Yes
Towns	
Town of Augusta	Yes
Town of Harrisburg	Yes
Hospital Districts	
Ripley County Memorial Hospital District	No
Summary of Results	
Total responses meeting statute	222
Total responses not meeting statute	12
Total	234
Error percentage	5.1%

Sunshine Law Review

Recording Policy

For each political subdivision we mailed a public record request asking if the entity had a policy or ordinance on recording public meetings and to provide a copy, if available. Political subdivisions providing a response addressing the question and providing a copy when available and those responding to all other requested items but not addressing the recording policy question are included in this appendix. "Yes" indicates the recording policy question was answered and documentation provided, if available. "No" indicates an adequate response to the recording policy question was not provided; however, other requested information was provided and is evaluated elsewhere in the report.

Political Subdivision	Was recording policy question fully addressed?
Cities	
City of Arkoe	Yes
City of Atlanta	Yes
City of Bellflower	Yes
City of Cassville	Yes
City of Crestwood	Yes
City of Ethel	Yes
City of Excelsior Estates	No
City of Freeman	Yes
City of Grain Valley	Yes
City of Greenville	Yes
City of Hawk Point	Yes
City of Knob Noster	Yes
City of La Plata	Yes
City of Ladue	Yes
City of Lamar	Yes
City of Louisiana	Yes
City of Matthews	Yes
City of Memphis	Yes
City of Montrose	Yes
City of New Bloomfield	Yes
City of New London	Yes
City of Pleasant Hill	Yes
City of Prairie Home	Yes
City of Sarcoxie	Yes
City of St. Peters	Yes
City of Stanberry	Yes
City of Union Star	Yes
City of Wentzville	Yes



Sunshine Law Review
Recording Policy

Political Subdivision	Was recording policy question fully addressed?
School Districts (SD)	
Blackwater R-II SD	Yes
Brentwood SD	Yes
Brunswick R-II SD	Yes
Chilhowee R-IV SD	Yes
Chillicothe R-II SD	No
Clark County R-I SD	Yes
DeSoto 73 SD	Yes
East Lynne 40 SD	Yes
East Prairie R-II SD	Yes
Gasconade County R-I SD	Yes
Holcomb R-III SD	Yes
Hume R-VIII SD	Yes
Kelso C-7 SD	No
Kirbyville R-VI SD	Yes
Kirkwood R-VII SD	Yes
Knob Noster R-VIII SD	Yes
Knox County R-I SD	Yes
Laclede County C-5 SD	Yes
Laquey R-V SD	Yes
Meadow Heights R-II SD	Yes
Middle Grove C-1 SD	Yes
Missouri City 56 SD	Yes
Mountain View-Birch Tree R-III SD	Yes
Pleasant Hill R-III SD	Yes
Raymore-Peculiar R-II SD	Yes
Republic R-III SD	Yes
School of the Osage R-II SD	Yes
Scotland County R-I SD	Yes
Stockton R-I SD	Yes
Summersville R-II SD	Yes
Zalma R-V SD	Yes
Transportation Development Districts (TDD)	
Adams Farm TDD	Yes
Belton-Cass Regional TDD	Yes
Country Club Plaza TDD	Yes
Douglas Station TDD	Yes
East-West Arterial TDD	No
Ehrhardt Properties TDD	Yes
Harrisonville Market Place B TDD	Yes
Harrisonville Towne Center TDD	Yes



Sunshine Law Review
Recording Policy

Political Subdivision	Was recording policy question fully addressed?
Horseshoe Bend TDD	Yes
Lucas & Hunt/Chandler TDD	Yes
Market at McKnight TDD	Yes
Mexico Road TDD	Yes
Northwoods TDD	Yes
Olive Boulevard TDD	Yes
Rock Bridge Center TDD	Yes
St. Cyr Road TDD	Yes
St. John Crossings TDD	Yes
Stadium Corridor TDD	Yes
Village of Green Hills TDD	No
Fire Protection Districts (FPD)	
Armstrong FPD	Yes
Cedar Hill FPD	Yes
Dadeville Rural FPD	Yes
Elm Township FPD	Yes
Mercer County FPD	No
Monroe City Area FPD	Yes
Morrisville FPD	Yes
North Callaway FPD	Yes
Pleasant Hill FPD	Yes
Rosendale FPD	Yes
South Callaway FPD	Yes
Steelville FPD	Yes
Tri-County FPD	Yes
Versailles FPD 4	Yes
West Peculiar FPD	Yes
Townships	
Bogard Township of Henry County	Yes
Bowling Green Township of Chariton County	Yes
Freeborn Township of Dunklin County	Yes
Jackson Township of Linn County	Yes
Liberty Township of Stoddard County	Yes
Myers Township of Grundy County	Yes
Piney Township of Texas County	Yes
Upton Township of Texas County	Yes
Public Water Supply Districts (PWSD)	
PWSD 1 of DeKalb County	Yes
PWSD 1 of Gentry County	Yes
PWSD 1 of Newton County	Yes
PWSD 1 of Reynolds County	No



Sunshine Law Review
Recording Policy

Political Subdivision	Was recording policy question fully addressed?
PWSD 2 of Andrew County	Yes
PWSD 2 of Camden County	Yes
PWSD 2 of St. Charles County	Yes
PWSD 2 of Wayne County	Yes
PWSD 4 of Cape Girardeau County	Yes
PWSD 4 of Henry County	Yes
PWSD 4 of Texas County	Yes
PWSD 7 of Bates County	Yes
PWSD 7 of Clay County	Yes
PWSD 8 of Cass County	Yes
PWSD 8 of Platte County	Yes
Thomas Hill PWSD 1 of Randolph County	Yes
Community Improvement Districts (CID)	
Barathaven CID	Yes
Blue Parkway and Colbern Road CID	Yes
Brentwood Blvd/Clayton Rd CID	Yes
Brighton Creek Commons CID	Yes
College Station CID	No
Crestwood Market CID	Yes
Crossroads Shopping Center CID	Yes
East Hills CID	Yes
Eureka South I-44 CID	Yes
I-470 CID	Yes
Mountain Farm CID	No
Phoenix Center II CID	Yes
Railway Exchange Building CID	Yes
Stateline CID	Yes
The Fountains CID	Yes
Viking Conference Center CID	Yes
Villages	
Village of Agency	Yes
Village of Lamar Heights	Yes
Village of Loch Lloyd	Yes
Village of Moundville	Yes
Village of Rushville	Yes
Village of Sibley	No
Village of South Greenfield	Yes
Village of Utica	No
Village of Weatherby	Yes
Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCD)	
Andrew County SWCD	Yes



Sunshine Law Review
Recording Policy

Political Subdivision	Was recording policy question fully addressed?
Audrain County SWCD	Yes
Barry County SWCD	Yes
Camden County SWCD	Yes
Carter County SWCD	Yes
Cooper County SWCD	Yes
Franklin County SWCD	Yes
Howard County SWCD	Yes
Maries County SWCD	Yes
Monroe County SWCD	Yes
St. Francois County SWCD	Yes
Ste. Genevieve County SWCD	Yes
Worth County SWCD	Yes
Library Districts (LD)	
Carthage Public LD	No
Christian County LD	Yes
Gentry County LD	Yes
Hannibal Free Public LD	Yes
Knox County LD	Yes
Livingston County Memorial LD	Yes
Mercer County LD	No
Rolling Hills Consolidated LD	Yes
Scotland County LD	No
Scott County LD	Yes
St. Clair County LD	Yes
Wright County LD	No
Levee/Drainage Districts	
Benton Township & Rock Creek Drainage District	Yes
Bois Brule Levee & Drainage District of Perry County	Yes
Drainage District 28 of Stoddard County	Yes
Elk Chute Drainage District	Yes
Halls Levee District of Buchanan County	Yes
Levee District 2 of Ray County	Yes
Sugartree Drainage District	Yes
Special Road Districts (SRD)	
Buck Prairie SRD of Lawrence County	Yes
Flemington SRD of Polk County	Yes
Greasy Creek SRD 35 of Barry County	Yes
Hillsboro SRD of Jefferson County	Yes
Laclede County SRD	Yes
Spickard SRD	Yes
Wellsville SRD of Montgomery County	Yes



Sunshine Law Review
Recording Policy

Political Subdivision	Was recording policy question fully addressed?
Wolfe Creek SRD of Ripley County	Yes
Ambulance Districts (AD)	
Chariton County AD	Yes
Dade County AD	Yes
Grand River Regional AD	Yes
Iron County AD	Yes
Knox County AD	Yes
Mountain View-Summersville AD	Yes
Saline County AD 3	Yes
Taney County AD	Yes
Van-Far AD	Yes
Counties	
Adair County	Yes
Franklin County	Yes
Lawrence County	Yes
Miller County	Yes
Mississippi County	Yes
Scotland County	Yes
Warren County	Yes
Health Departments/Health Centers	
Hickory County Health Department	Yes
Madison County Health Department	Yes
Mercer County Health Department	Yes
Moniteau County Health Center	Yes
Nodaway County Health Center	Yes
911 Boards/Emergency Services	
Chariton County 911 Board	Yes
Jasper County Emergency Services	Yes
Jefferson County 911 Board	Yes
Saline County 911 Board	Yes
Sewer Districts	
Camelot Sewer District	Yes
Special Business Districts (SBD)	
Bi-State Commission SBD	Yes
Cape Girardeau SBD	Yes
Clayton SBD	Yes
Kirkwood SBD	Yes



Sunshine Law Review
Recording Policy

Political Subdivision	Was recording policy question fully addressed?
Nursing Home Districts/Adult Care Centers	
Golden Age Nursing Home District 1	Yes
Twin Pines Adult Care Center	Yes
Towns	
Town of Augusta	Yes
Town of Harrisburg	Yes
Hospital Districts	
Ripley County Memorial Hospital District	No
Summary of Results	
Total responses meeting statute (Yes)	201
Total responses not meeting statute (No)	16
Total	217
Error percentage	7.4%

Sunshine Law Review

Public Record Request Results

Sorted by County

This table includes the same information listed in Appendix B, with the addition of the county where each political subdivision is located. For political subdivisions that are located across county borders, the entity is listed under each of the counties where it is located, which means some political subdivisions are listed multiple times. The rest of the information in this table is identical to information presented in Appendix B, which provides results related to compliance with the 3 day rule outlined in the Sunshine Law and overall compliance for all tested Sunshine Law requirements.

Legend

N/A - Compliance could not be evaluated

NR - No response received

UD - Undelivered per USPS

County	Political Subdivision	Response Received Timely?	Met All Applicable Criteria?
Adair	Adair County	Yes	Yes
	Twin Pines Adult Care Center	Yes	Yes
Andrew	Andrew County Soil and Water Conservation District	Yes	Yes
	Grand River Regional Ambulance District	Yes	Yes
	Public Water Supply District 2 of Andrew County	Yes	Yes
	Rolling Hills Consolidated Library District	No	No
	Rosendale Fire Protection District	No	No
	Village of Cosby ⁴	Yes	No
Atchison	Benton Township & Rock Creek Drainage District	Yes	Yes
	City of Westboro ¹	Yes	N/A
Audrain	Audrain County Soil and Water Conservation District	No	No
	Middle Grove C-1 School District	No	No
	Van-Far Ambulance District	Yes	No
Barry	Arrow Point Village, Inc.	NR	No
	Barry County Soil and Water Conservation District	Yes	Yes
	City of Cassville	Yes	Yes
	Greasy Creek Special Road District 35 of Barry County	Yes	Yes
	Jenkins Special Road District 20 of Barry County	UD	UD
	Mineral Springs Special Road District 10 of Barry County ⁴	No	No
	Ozark Special Road District of Barry County	UD	UD
Barton	City of Lamar	Yes	Yes
	Village of Lamar Heights	No	No
Bates	Appleton City R-II School District ¹	Yes	N/A
	Charlotte Township of Bates County	NR	No
	City of Rockville	NR	No
	Grand River Township of Bates County	NR	No
	Hume R-VIII School District	Yes	No
	Osage Township of Bates County	NR	No
	Public Water Supply District 7 of Bates County	No	No
	West Point Township of Bates County	NR	No
	Benton	City of Cole Camp ¹	Yes
	City of Lincoln ¹	Yes	N/A
	Zalma R-V School District	Yes	Yes



Sunshine Law Review
Public Record Request Results
Sorted by County

County	Political Subdivision	Response Received Timely?	Met All Applicable Criteria?
Bollinger	Meadow Heights R-II School District	Yes	Yes
Boone	Northwoods Transportation Development District ⁹	No	No
	Rock Bridge Center Transportation Development District	No	No
	Stadium Corridor Transportation Development District	Yes	Yes
	Town of Harrisburg	Yes	No
Buchanan	East Hills Community Improvement District	Yes	No
	Halls Levee District of Buchanan County	No	No
	Rolling Hills Consolidated Library District	No	No
	South St. Joseph Industrial Sewer District	NR	No
	Village of Agency	Yes	Yes
	Village of Rushville	No	No
Butler	North Inter-River Drainage District	NR	No
	Stateline Community Improvement District	Yes	Yes
Caldwell	City of Kingston ¹	Yes	N/A
	New York R-IV School District	NR	No
	Public Water Supply District 2 of Caldwell County ¹	Yes	N/A
Callaway	City of New Bloomfield	Yes	No
	North Callaway Fire Protection District	Yes	No
	South Callaway Fire Protection District ¹	Yes	N/A
Camden	Camden County	NR	No
	Camden County Soil and Water Conservation District	Yes	No
	Camelot Sewer District ¹	Yes	N/A
	Public Water Supply District 1 of Camden County ⁵	No	No
	Public Water Supply District 2 of Camden County	Yes	No
	School of the Osage R-II School District	Yes	Yes
	Tri-County Fire Protection District	Yes	No
Cape Girardeau	Cape Girardeau County Public Health Department ¹	Yes	N/A
	Cape Girardeau Special Business District ⁹	Yes	Yes
	Meadow Heights R-II School District	Yes	Yes
	Public Water Supply District 4 of Cape Girardeau County	No	No
	Town of Allenville	UD	UD
	Village of Whitewater	NR	No
Carroll	Big Creek - Hurricane Creek Watershed Subdistrict ¹	No	No
	Brunswick R-II School District	Yes	No
	Carroll County Soil and Water Conservation District	NR	No
	Norborne Public Library District	NR	No
	Prairie Township of Carroll County	NR	No
	Sugartree Drainage District	No	No
Carter	Carter County Soil and Water Conservation District	Yes	Yes
Cass	Belton-Cass Regional Transportation Development District	Yes	Yes
	City of East Lynne ¹	No	No
	City of Freeman	Yes	Yes



Sunshine Law Review
Public Record Request Results
Sorted by County

County	Political Subdivision	Response Received Timely?	Met All Applicable Criteria?
	City of Pleasant Hill	Yes	Yes
	East Lynne 40 School District	Yes	No
	Eastern Hills Community Improvement District ¹	Yes	N/A
	Harrisonville Market Place B Transportation Development District	No	No
	Harrisonville Towne Center Transportation Development District	No	No
	I-470 Community Improvement District	Yes	Yes
	Pleasant Hill Fire Protection District	Yes	Yes
	Pleasant Hill R-III School District	No	No
	Public Water Supply District 3 of Cass County	UD	UD
	Public Water Supply District 8 of Cass County ⁹	Yes	Yes
	Raymore-Peculiar R-II School District	Yes	No
	Village of Loch Lloyd	Yes	No
	West Peculiar Fire Protection District	No	No
Cedar	Public Water Supply District 1 of Cedar County	NR	No
	Stockton R-I School District	Yes	No
Chariton	Bowling Green Township of Chariton County	Yes	No
	Brunswick R-II School District	Yes	No
	Chariton County 911 Board	Yes	Yes
	Chariton County Ambulance District	Yes	No
Christian	Christian County Library District	No	No
	Republic R-III School District	Yes	No
Clark	Clark County R-I School District	Yes	Yes
	Scotland County R-I School District	Yes	Yes
Clay	Bi-State Commission Special Business District	Yes	Yes
	Brighton Creek Commons Community Improvement District	Yes	Yes
	City of Excelsior Estates	No	No
	Crossroads Shopping Center Community Improvement District	Yes	Yes
	Mid-Continent Public Library District	Yes	No
	Missouri City 56 School District	Yes	No
	New Liberty Hospital District ¹	No	No
	Public Water Supply District 7 of Clay County ¹	No	No
Cole	Cole County Fire Protection District	UD	UD
Cooper	Blackwater R-II School District	No	No
	City of Boonville ¹	Yes	N/A
	City of Prairie Home	No	No
	Cooper County Soil and Water Conservation District	Yes	Yes
Crawford	Steeleville Fire Protection District	Yes	Yes
Dade	Dadeville Rural Fire Protection District	Yes	No
	Dade County Ambulance District	Yes	No
	Stockton R-I School District	Yes	No
	Village of Arcola	NR	No
	Village of South Greenfield	Yes	Yes



Sunshine Law Review
Public Record Request Results
Sorted by County

County	Political Subdivision	Response Received Timely?	Met All Applicable Criteria?	
DeKalb	City of Union Star	Yes	No	
	Grand River Regional Ambulance District	Yes	Yes	
	Maysville R-I School District	NR	No	
	Public Water Supply District 1 of DeKalb County	Yes	Yes	
	Sherman Township of DeKalb County	UD	UD	
	Village of Weatherby	No	No	
Dent	Reynolds County Ambulance District	UD	UD	
Douglas	Plainview R-VIII School District	NR	No	
Dunklin	City of Malden ²	Yes	N/A	
	Consolidated Drainage District 2 of Dunklin County	NR	No	
	Dunklin County ⁴	Yes	No	
	Freeborn Township of Dunklin County	No	No	
	Holcomb R-III School District	Yes	No	
Franklin	Franklin County	Yes	Yes	
	Franklin County Soil and Water Conservation District	Yes	Yes	
	Gasconade County R-I School District	Yes	Yes	
	Phoenix Center II Community Improvement District	Yes	Yes	
	Sullivan Marketplace Community Improvement District	UD	UD	
Gasconade	Gasconade County R-I School District	Yes	Yes	
	Gentry	City of Stanberry	Yes	Yes
		Gentry County Library District	Yes	No
		Grand River Regional Ambulance District	Yes	Yes
		Public Water Supply District 1 of Gentry County ¹	Yes	N/A
Greene		College Station Community Improvement District	Yes	No
	East-West Arterial Transportation Development District	Yes	No	
	Greene County	NR	No	
	Republic R-III School District	Yes	No	
	Strafford Fire Protection District ¹	Yes	N/A	
Grundy	Jefferson Township of Grundy County ⁴	No	No	
	Liberty Township of Grundy County	NR	No	
	Myers Township of Grundy County	No	No	
	Spickard Special Road District	No	No	
Harrison	Clay Township of Harrison County	NR	No	
	Grand River Regional Ambulance District	Yes	Yes	
	Marion Township of Harrison County ¹	Yes	N/A	
	White Oak Township of Harrison County ¹	Yes	N/A	
Henry	Bogard Township of Henry County ¹	Yes	N/A	
	Chilhowee R-IV School District	Yes	Yes	
	City of Montrose	Yes	No	
	City of Urich ¹	Yes	N/A	
	Public Water Supply District 4 of Henry County ¹	Yes	N/A	
	Village of Tightwad	NR	No	



Sunshine Law Review
Public Record Request Results
Sorted by County

County	Political Subdivision	Response Received Timely?	Met All Applicable Criteria?	
Hickory	City of Wheatland ¹	Yes	N/A	
	Hickory County Health Department	Yes	No	
Holt	Bigelow Independent Special Road District of Holt County ¹	Yes	N/A	
	Levee District 9 of Holt County ¹	Yes	N/A	
Howard	Mound City Rural Fire Protection District ¹	Yes	N/A	
	Armstrong Fire Protection District	Yes	No	
	Bonne Femme Levee District 1 ⁷	Yes	N/A	
Howell	Howard County Soil and Water Conservation District	Yes	Yes	
	City of Mountain View ¹	Yes	N/A	
	Mountain View-Birch Tree R-III School District	Yes	Yes	
Iron	MountainView-Summersville Ambulance District	No	No	
	Iron County Ambulance District	Yes	No	
Jackson	Adams Farm Transportation Development District	Yes	No	
	Bi-State Commission Special Business District	Yes	Yes	
	Blue Parkway and Colbern Road Community Improvement District	Yes	Yes	
	City of Grain Valley	Yes	Yes	
	City of Pleasant Hill	Yes	Yes	
	Country Club Plaza Transportation Development District	Yes	No	
	Douglas Station Transportation Development District	Yes	Yes	
	I-470 Community Improvement District	Yes	Yes	
	Mid-Continent Public Library District	Yes	No	
	Village of River Bend	UD	UD	
	Village of Sibley	Yes	No	
	Jasper	Briarbrook Community Improvement District	NR	No
		Carl Junction Fire Protection District	NR	No
Carthage Public Library District		No	No	
City of Sarcoxie		No	No	
Jasper County Emergency Services		Yes	Yes	
Peachtree Community Improvement District		NR	No	
Village of Reeds		NR	No	
Jefferson	Antonia Fire Protection District ¹	Yes	N/A	
	Cedar Hill Fire Protection District ¹	Yes	N/A	
	DeSoto 73 School District	Yes	Yes	
	Hillsboro Special Road District of Jefferson County	Yes	No	
	Jefferson County 911 Board	Yes	Yes	
Johnson	Lake Adelle Sewer District	UD	UD	
	Chilhowee R-IV School District	Yes	Yes	
	City of Knob Noster	Yes	No	
Knox	Knob Noster R-VIII School District	Yes	Yes	
	Knox County Ambulance District	Yes	Yes	
	Knox County Library District	Yes	Yes	
	Knox County R-I School District	Yes	Yes	



Sunshine Law Review
Public Record Request Results
Sorted by County

County	Political Subdivision	Response Received Timely?	Met All Applicable Criteria?
Laclede	Laclede County C-5 School District	No	No
	Laclede County Special Road District	Yes	No
	The Fountains Community Improvement District	Yes	Yes
	Tri-County Fire Protection District	Yes	No
Lafayette	City of Wellington ¹	Yes	N/A
Lawrence	Buck Prairie Special Road District of Lawrence County	Yes	No
	Lawrence County	Yes	No
	Village of Hoberg	NR	No
Lewis	Clark County R-I School District	Yes	Yes
	Knox County R-I School District	Yes	Yes
Lincoln	City of Hawk Point	Yes	Yes
	Lincoln County	NR	No
Linn	Enterprise Township of Linn County	NR	No
	Jackson Township of Linn County	Yes	No
Livingston	Big Creek - Hurricane Creek Watershed Subdistrict ¹	No	No
	Chillicothe R-II School District	No	No
	City of Chula	NR	No
	Livingston County Memorial Library District	Yes	No
	Livingston County Soil and Water Conservation District ¹	Yes	N/A
	Village of Utica	No	No
Macon	City of Atlanta	Yes	No
	City of Ethel	Yes	No
	City of La Plata	Yes	No
	Knox County R-I School District	Yes	Yes
Madison	Madison County Health Department	Yes	Yes
Maries	Maries County Soil and Water Conservation District	Yes	Yes
Marion	Hannibal 60 School District ²	No	No
	Hannibal Free Public Library District	Yes	Yes
	Marion County Nursing Home District	NR	No
	Monroe City Area Fire Protection District	No	No
Mercer	Mercer County Fire Protection District	No	No
	Mercer County Health Department	Yes	Yes
	Mercer County Library District	No	No
	Public Water Supply District 1 of Mercer County	NR	No
Miller	Cole County Fire Protection District	UD	UD
	Horseshoe Bend Transportation Development District	Yes	Yes
	Miller County	Yes	No
Mississippi	School of the Osage R-II School District	Yes	Yes
	City of East Prairie ¹	Yes	N/A
	East Prairie R-II School District	Yes	No
	Mississippi County	Yes	No
	Mississippi County Soil and Water Conservation District	UD	UD



Sunshine Law Review
Public Record Request Results
Sorted by County

County	Political Subdivision	Response Received Timely?	Met All Applicable Criteria?
Moniteau	Moniteau County Health Center	Yes	Yes
Monroe	Middle Grove C-1 School District	No	No
	Monroe City Area Fire Protection District	No	No
	Monroe County Soil and Water Conservation District	Yes	Yes
Montgomery	City of Bellflower	Yes	Yes
	City of Middletown ¹	Yes	N/A
	Gasconade County R-I School District	Yes	Yes
	Montgomery County Health Department ¹	Yes	N/A
	Wellsville Special Road District of Montgomery County	Yes	Yes
Morgan	Golden Age Nursing Home District 1	No	No
	Morgan County Health Center	NR	No
	School of the Osage R-II School District	Yes	Yes
	Versailles Fire Protection District 4	No	No
New Madrid	City of Matthews	Yes	No
	City of Morehouse ¹	Yes	N/A
	East Prairie R-II School District	Yes	No
Newton	Public Water Supply District 1 of Newton County	Yes	Yes
Nodaway	City of Arkoe	No	No
	Nodaway County Health Center	Yes	Yes
Osage	Cole County Fire Protection District	UD	UD
	Lake Drainage District 1 of Osage County	NR	No
Pemiscot	Elk Chute Drainage District	No	No
Perry	Bois Brule Levee & Drainage District of Perry County	No	No
Pettis	Knob Noster R-VIII School District	Yes	Yes
	Pettis County Fire Protection District 1	NR	No
Pike	City of Louisiana	No	No
	Louisiana Public Library District	NR	No
	Pike County Health Department ¹	Yes	N/A
	Van-Far Ambulance District	Yes	No
Platte	Bi-State Commission Special Business District	Yes	Yes
	KCI/I-29 Community Improvement District ⁶	Yes	N/A
	Mid-Continent Public Library District	Yes	No
	Public Water Supply District 8 of Platte County	Yes	No
	Tracy Highlands Transportation Development District	UD	UD
	Village of Green Hills Transportation Development District ³	Yes	No
Polk	Flemington Special Road District of Polk County	Yes	Yes
	Morrisville Fire Protection District	Yes	Yes
Pulaski	Ehrhardt Properties Transportation Development District	Yes	Yes
	Laquey R-V School District	Yes	No
	Tri-County Fire Protection District	Yes	No
Putnam	Elm Township Fire Protection District	Yes	Yes
	Liberty Township of Putnam County	NR	No



Sunshine Law Review
Public Record Request Results
Sorted by County

County	Political Subdivision	Response Received Timely?	Met All Applicable Criteria?
	Village of Powersville	NR	No
Ralls	City of New London	Yes	Yes
	Hannibal 60 School District ²	No	No
	Monroe City Area Fire Protection District	No	No
Randolph	Armstrong Fire Protection District	Yes	No
	Higbee Fire Protection District	NR	No
	Thomas Hill Public Water Supply District 1 of Randolph County	Yes	Yes
Ray	City of Crystal Lakes Special Road District ¹	Yes	N/A
	City of Excelsior Estates	No	No
	Levee District 2 of Ray County	Yes	Yes
	Public Water Supply District 1 of Ray County ¹	Yes	N/A
Reynolds	Public Water Supply District 1 of Reynolds County	Yes	No
	Reynolds County Ambulance District	UD	UD
Ripley	Ripley County Memorial Hospital District	No	No
	Wolfe Creek Special Road District of Ripley County	Yes	No
Saline	Blackwater R-II School District	No	No
	City of Malta Bend ¹	No	No
	Saline County Ambulance District 3	Yes	No
	Saline County 911 Board ¹	Yes	N/A
Scotland	City of Memphis	Yes	Yes
	Knox County R-I School District	Yes	Yes
	Scotland County	Yes	Yes
	Scotland County Library District	No	No
	Scotland County R-I School District	Yes	Yes
Scott	Kelso C-7 School District	No	No
	Public Water Supply District 1 of Scott County	NR	No
	Scott County Library District	No	No
Shannon	Mountain View-Birch Tree R-III School District	Yes	Yes
	Mountain View-Summersville Ambulance District	No	No
	Summersville R-II School District	Yes	Yes
Shelby	Monroe City Area Fire Protection District	No	No
St. Charles	Augusta Fire Protection District	UD	UD
	BaratHaven Community Improvement District	Yes	Yes
	City of St. Peters	Yes	Yes
	City of Wentzville	Yes	Yes
	Kingsmill Transportation Development District	UD	UD
	Mexico Road Transportation Development District	Yes	Yes
	Mountain Farm Community Improvement District	Yes	No
	Public Water Supply District 2 of St. Charles County	Yes	No
	Rivers Pointe Fire Protection District	NR	No
	Town of Augusta	No	No
	Wentzville Parkway I Transportation Development District	NR	No



Sunshine Law Review
Public Record Request Results
Sorted by County

County	Political Subdivision	Response Received Timely?	Met All Applicable Criteria?
St. Clair	Appleton City R-II School District ¹	Yes	N/A
	City of Lowry City	NR	No
	St. Clair County Library District	Yes	No
St. Francois	DeSoto 73 School District	Yes	Yes
	St. Francois County Soil and Water Conservation District	Yes	Yes
St. Louis City	1100 Washington Avenue Community Improvement District ¹	No	No
	City Hospital Laundry Building Transportation Development District	UD	UD
	Railway Exchange Building Community Improvement District ¹	No	No
St. Louis County	Southtown Transportation Development District ⁸	Yes	N/A
	Brentwood Blvd/Clayton Rd Community Improvement District	Yes	Yes
	Brentwood School District	Yes	Yes
	City of Crestwood	Yes	Yes
	City of Ladue	Yes	Yes
	Clayton Special Business District	Yes	Yes
	Crestwood Market Community Improvement District	Yes	Yes
	Eureka South I-44 Community Improvement District ⁶	Yes	N/A
	Kirkwood R-VII School District	Yes	No
	Kirkwood Special Business District	Yes	Yes
	Lucas & Hunt/Chandler Transportation Development District	Yes	No
	Market at McKnight Transportation Development District	Yes	Yes
	Missouri River-Bonfils Sewer District	NR	No
	Olive Boulevard Transportation Development District	Yes	Yes
	St. Cyr Road Transportation Development District	Yes	Yes
	St. John Crossings Transportation Development District	Yes	Yes
	Viking Conference Center Community Improvement District	Yes	Yes
Ste. Genevieve	DeSoto 73 School District	Yes	Yes
	Ste. Genevieve County Soil and Water Conservation District	Yes	Yes
Stoddard	City of Bloomfield	UD	UD
	Districts 1-7-13 & 33-14-17-19 of Stoddard County	UD	UD
	Drainage District 28 of Stoddard County	No	No
	Duck Creek Township of Stoddard County	NR	No
	Liberty Township of Stoddard County	No	No
Taney	Zalma R-V School District	Yes	Yes
	Kirbyville R-VI School District	No	No
Texas	Taney County Ambulance District	No	No
	Mountain View-Birch Tree R-III School District	Yes	Yes
Vernon	Mountain View-Summersville Ambulance District	No	No
	Piney Township of Texas County	No	No
	Public Water Supply District 4 of Texas County	Yes	No
	Summersville R-II School District	Yes	Yes
	Upton Township of Texas County	No	No
	Hume R-VIII School District	Yes	No



Sunshine Law Review
Public Record Request Results
Sorted by County

County	Political Subdivision	Response Received Timely?	Met All Applicable Criteria?
	Moundville Township of Vernon County	NR	No
	Village of Moundville	Yes	No
Warren	Gasconade County R-I School District	Yes	Yes
	Warren County	Yes	No
Wayne	City of Greenville	Yes	No
	Clearwater Ambulance District	NR	No
	Public Water Supply District 2 of Wayne County	No	No
Webster	Strafford Fire Protection District ¹	Yes	N/A
Worth	Worth County Soil and Water Conservation District ¹	Yes	N/A
Wright	Wright County Library District	No	No

¹ The political subdivisions requested payment prior to providing requested documentation, which is permitted by the Sunshine Law. For these political subdivisions, we were only able to evaluate a timely response to the initial inquiry. If the entity provided a response to either the custodian or recording policy request it will be included in Appendix E or F, respectively. Because we did not submit the requested fee when entities asked for prepayment, political subdivisions that responded timely are not evaluated for overall compliance since all criteria could not be reviewed. For political subdivisions that requested payment, but did not respond timely, overall compliance has been indicated as "No."

² The political subdivisions requested clarification prior to providing requested documentation, which is permitted by the Sunshine Law. For these political subdivisions, we were only able to evaluate a timely response to the initial inquiry. If the entity provided a response to either the custodian or recording policy request it will be included in Appendix E or F, respectively. Because we did respond to clarification questions, political subdivisions that responded timely are not evaluated for overall compliance since all criteria could not be reviewed. For political subdivisions that requested clarification, but did not respond timely, overall compliance has been indicated as "No."

³ This political subdivision was established in 2016 while our request was for documentation of meeting minutes and notices from 2015. Minutes and notices were not evaluated in Appendix D, however, compliance has been evaluated for the custodian of records and the recording policy in Appendixes E and F, respectively. Overall compliance is evaluated based on the applicable criteria.

⁴ These political subdivisions denied our public records request without further knowledge of who made the request or why the request was made, or required the requestor to appear in person. Such restrictions to public record access are not permitted by the Sunshine Law.

⁵ This political subdivision sent a letter stating we should expect documentation to be received at a later date. We did not receive a subsequent response with the requested items.

⁶ These political subdivisions dissolved prior to the public records request being made. Minimal information could be provided due to the entity being dissolved.

⁷ The individual who responded for this political subdivision indicated the request had been forwarded to the custodian of records. We could not verify if that occurred, thus no further compliance has been evaluated.

⁸ This political subdivision requested a form to be filled out in order to obtain documentation. Because we did not submit the requested form the political subdivision was not evaluated for overall compliance.

⁹ These political subdivisions will not appear on Appendix D since they did not conduct any meetings in 2015. They were only evaluated for timeliness of response, custodian of records, and whether they addressed the recording policy question.