



MISSOURI ETHICS COMMISSION

P.O. Box 1254

Jefferson City, MO 65102

www.mec.mo.gov

(573) 751-2020 / (800) 392-8660

Julie A. Allen
Executive Director

Amended April 15, 2009

The Missouri Ethics Commission, at its April 1, 2009 meeting, took the following actions:

1. The following opinions were issued:

Re: Conflict of Interest - 2009.04.CI.002

Re: Conflict of Interest - 2009.04.CI.003

2. The following case was closed with a letter:

09C036 Denise Leach, St. Louis Co., Sections 130.031(8) RSMo.

3. The Commission held the following hearings and ruled as follows:

08A159 Curtis Royston and Committee to Elect Curtis Royston State Representative, St. Louis Co.

The Commission found probable cause that Curtis Royston and Committee to Elect Curtis Royston State Representative violated Sections 130.046.1(3), 130.046.1(1), and 130.046.1(2) RSMo for violations of the campaign finance disclosure laws.

The Commission entered an order that a fee be imposed against Curtis Royston and Committee to Elect Curtis Royston State Representative in the amount of \$3,000.00 pursuant to §105.961.4(6) RSMo. However, if Respondents file all necessary reports with the Commission and if Respondents pay \$600.00 of that fee within forty- five (45) days after the date of the Order, the remainder of the fee will be stayed for two years, subject to the provisions below. If Respondents have not committed any further violations of the campaign finance disclosure laws pursuant to Chapter 130, RSMo 2000, during the two year stay then Respondent will not be required to pay the balance of this fee. If, however, Respondents are found to have violated the campaign finance laws pursuant to Chapter 130, RSMo, during this two year stay, Respondents will be required to pay the balance of the fee as originally imposed by the Commission. The amount of the balance will be due immediately upon final adjudication finding Respondent guilty of such a violation.

08E157A Robin Littrell, Ray Co.,

The Commission found probable cause that Robin Littrell violated Sections 135.060, 135.070, 135.080 RSMo of the Municipal Code of the City of Richmond, Missouri, requiring the advertisements for bids for public work.

The Commission entered an order that it issue a letter of reprimand to Robin Littrell pursuant to Section 105.961.4(4), RSMo.

4. The Commission approved the following Joint Stipulations of facts, waiver of hearing before the Missouri Ethics Commission, and joint proposed Consent Order with findings of fact and conclusions of law:

09E193 and 09E194 Chris Belcher, Ed.D, Superintendent Kearney R-I School District, Clay Co.

The Commission issued a consent order finding probable cause that Chris Belcher, Ed.D. violated §115.646, RSMo and Kearney School Board Policy, Section D: Fiscal Management, DCB: Political Campaigns, when public funds were expended directly by a clerical employee of the district to advocate or support a ballot measure on the November 4, 2008 election.

The Commission ordered that it issue a letter of reprimand to Chris Belcher pursuant to Section 105.961.4(4), RSMo. It is further the order of the Missouri Ethics Commission that this joint stipulation and consent order be referred to the appropriate disciplinary authority over Respondent Chris Belcher pursuant to Section 105.961.3, RSMo.

The Kearney R-I School District will require immediate reimbursement for the full amount of the public funds expended: \$10.70.

On or before May 1, 2009, the District will provide a required training program for administrators, as well as relevant clerical staff, regarding the requirements of §115.646, RSMo and the relationship of this statute to other applicable law, including but not limited to the disclosure and equal access requirements of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, the No Child Left Behind Act, and the First Amendment. During the remainder of the 2008-2009 school year and for persons employed to service during the 2009-2010 school year, the materials used for the training required under paragraph d above will be provided to new administrators, as well as new, relevant clerical employees. Such materials shall be provided to the administrators and relevant clerical employees within ten (10) business days after their first day of active service with the District.

No later than April 10, 2009, the District will prepare a written notice regarding the requirements and prohibitions of §115.646, RSMo and will provide the notice to all employees of the District. The notice will be distributed at least annually. The District will prepare a written notice regarding the requirements and prohibitions of §115.646, RSMo and will provide the notice to campaign committees organized for the purpose of supporting ballot measures pertaining to the school district. The notice will be provided by the District to such campaign committees known by the superintendent of schools to exist; upon request of such campaign committee; or in response to inquiries from such committees regarding potential use of school facilities or resources. The written notice shall be equally available to committees organized to oppose ballot measures pertaining to the school district.

The Board of Education will direct the Superintendent of Schools, in writing, to provide written notice to the individual clerical employee who expended the funds identified above that school equipment, school materials, school funds, and school accounts may not be used to promote or oppose a ballot measure or candidate for public office. The written notification to the clerical employee shall be issued no later than April 10, 2009. A copy of the written directive to the Superintendent and the written notification to the clerical employee will be provided to the Commission no later than five (5) business days after the clerical employee has received the written notification.

08E096 James Q. Cook, Jr., Pemiscot Co.

The Commission issued a consent order finding probable cause that James Q. Cook, Jr. violated § 105.454(3), RSMo, by participating in a matter in which he attempted to influence the decision of the Consolidated Public Water Supply District No. 1 of Pemiscot County, over which he had supervisory authority, when he knew that the result of such decision could be the acceptance of the performance of services in excess of \$500.00 per transaction or \$5,000.00 per annum to the business with which he is associated, without public notice and competitive bidding in which the bid or offer accepted was the lowest received.

The Commission ordered that that a fee be imposed in the amount of \$500.