



**AGENDA**  
**PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING**

Conference Room 202  
Thursday, February 12, 2026  
5:30 PM

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**II. ROLL CALL**

**III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- A. Approval of 12-8-2025 Public Health and Safety Committee Minutes

**IV. HALLOWEEN CONDUCT - SEX OFFENDERS**

- A. Amendment of the current City Ordinance to align the City Ordinance restrictions with the State of Missouri Statute
- B. Proposed Ordinance

**V. ST. LOUIS COUNTY PROPOSAL TO INCREASE INMATE HOUSING COST**

- A. St. Louis County Proposal to increase inmate housing cost

**VI. SELF-DRIVING VEHICLES**

- A. The Committee will discuss possible regulation of unmanned self-driving cars (Fully Autonomous Vehicles)
- B. Missouri House Bill regarding driverless vehicles

**VII. ELEMENTARY SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICERS (ESROs) - PILOT PROGRAM**

- A. The Committee will review a proposed pilot program for the staffing of the Elementary School Resource Officer (ESRO) position within the Police Department.

**VIII. OTHER**

**IX. NEXT MEETING**

## **X. ADJOURNMENT**

PERSONS REQUIRING AN ACCOMMODATION TO ATTEND AND PARTICIPATE IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH & SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING SHOULD CONTACT CITY CLERK VICKIE MCGOWND AT (636)537-6716 AT LEAST TWO (2) BUSINESS DAYS PRIOR TO THE MEETING.



## **RECORD OF PROCEEDING**

---

### **MEETING OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE CHESTERFIELD CITY HALL 690 CHESTERFIELD PARKWAY WEST CONFERENCE ROOM 202**

**DECEMBER 8, 2025**

---

Chairperson Mary Monachella, Ward I, called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

#### PRESENT

Chairperson Mary Monachella, Ward I  
Council Committee Member Patricia Tocco, Ward II  
Council Committee Member Lane Koch, Ward III  
Council Committee Member Gary Budoor, Ward IV  
Mayor Dan Hurt  
Councilmember Mary Ann Mastorakos, Ward II  
Assistant City Administrator Elliot Brown  
Major Dan Dunn  
City Prosecuting Attorney Tim Engelmeyer  
Associate City Attorney Nathan Bruns

#### ABSENT

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Councilmember Tocco made a motion, seconded by Councilmember Koch, to approve the September 29, 2025 Public Health and Safety Committee Meeting Minutes. A vote was taken with a unanimous affirmative result (4,0), and the motion was declared passed.

#### **REVISED SOLICITOR CERTIFICATION**

Attorney Nathan Bruns presented a revised Solicitor Certification document for the Committee's review.

The Committee members discussed the certification Councilmember Budoor requested that the hours of day that are allowable for solicitation be noted on the letter to residents when the solicitor's permit is issued along with the dates of the solicitation. This will be added.

Councilmember Tocco inquired about signage to stop solicitors, specifically if a subdivision can put notification of "No Solicitors" at the entrance to a subdivision. Attorney Bruns stated that the current provision in the City Code is for the sticker provided by the City that may be affixed to the residence. These stickers are available at the front desk at City Hall.

The recommended changes will be made by Attorney Bruns.

### **FEE STRUCTURE FOR CITY ATTORNEY, PROSECUTING ATTORNEY AND MUNICIPAL JUDGE**

Assistant City Administrator Elliot Brown presented the newly proposed fee structure for the City Attorney, Prosecuting Attorney and the Municipal Judge. It was noted that these rates were last adjusted in 2016 (City Attorney Chris Graville), 2001 (Prosecuting Attorney Timothy Engelmeyer), and 2021 (Municipal Judge Mark Gaertner). The new rates are comparable to those in other municipalities.

Councilmember Tocco inquired about the rates for paralegal and law students who assist the Attorneys. Mr. Bruns noted those positions were part of the last contract. Mr. Bruns will add those positions to the new engagement contract but there will be no change in the fees.

The Committee members reviewed the recommended increases for each position. They agreed that the proposed increases listed are reasonable. Therefore, the Committee member recommended approval of the recommended fees.

Councilmember Koch made a motion, seconded by Councilmember Budoor, to approve slate of increases represented in the new engagement contract and forward to City Council. A vote was taken with a unanimous affirmative result (4,0), and the motion was declared passed.

### **DEFERRED PROSECUTION COURT**

Prosecuting Attorney Tim Engelmeyer presented information on the Chesterfield Municipal Court Deferred Prosecution Court. This purpose of the program is to help rehabilitate offenders such as veterans, unhoused individuals, the mentally ill, and juveniles. The participants are screened by the Court and outside social workers before they are recommended for participation in the program. There is an entrance fee and a full schedule of mandated program attendance. Also, participants must submit to regular drug testing and still pay fines associated with their offense. Several other municipal courts in the area also participate in this program.

The aim of this program is to stop repeat offenders.

Prosecuting Attorney Engelmeyer presented statistics noting only two participants have dropped or failed program. He noted that these successes benefit not only the City of Chesterfield but the entire region. To date, the program is cost neutral to the City.

Prosecuting Attorney Engelmeyer thanked the Committee members for their support of the program.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cheryl Funkhouser  
Chief of Police

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dianne Johnson  
Administrative Assistant

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

## Chapter 210. Offenses

### Article IX. Sexual Offenses

#### Section 210.1550. Halloween, Restrictions On Conduct — Violations.

- A. Any person required to register as a sexual offender under Sections **589.400** to **589.425**, RSMo., shall be required on October 31st of each year to:
  - 1. Avoid all Halloween-related contact with children;
  - 2. Remain inside his/her residence between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 10:30 P.M. unless required to be elsewhere for just cause, including, but not limited to, employment or medical emergencies;
  - 3. Post a sign at his/her residence stating "No candy or treats at this residence"; and
  - 4. Leave all outside residential lighting off during the evening hours after 5:00 P.M.
- B. Any person required to register as a sexual offender under Sections **589.400** to **589.425**, RSMo., who violates the provisions of Subsection **(A)** of this Section shall be guilty of an ordinance violation.

Title XXXVIII CRIMES AND PUNISHMENT; PEACE OFFICERS AND PUBLIC DEFENDERS

Chapter 589

< > • Effective - 28 Aug 2008, highlighted 2 ↓

589.426. **Halloween, restrictions on conduct – violations, penalty.** – 1. Any person required to register as a sexual offender under sections 589.400 to 589.425 shall be required on October thirty-first of each year to:

- (1) Avoid all Halloween-related contact with children;
- (2) Remain inside his or her residence between the hours of 5 p.m. and 10:30 p.m. unless required to be elsewhere for just cause, including but not limited to employment or medical emergencies;
- (3) Post a sign at his or her residence stating, "No candy or treats at this residence"; and
- (4) Leave all outside residential lighting off during the evening hours after 5 p.m.

2. Any person required to register as a sexual offender under sections **589.400 to 589.425** who violates the provisions of subsection 1 of this section shall be guilty of a class A misdemeanor.

-----  
(L. 2008 S.B. 714, et al.)

(2024) Missouri's requirement that registered sex offenders post a sign stating "No candy or treats at this residence" on October thirty-first violates the First Amendment prohibition of compelled speech. This only relates to the enforcement of section 589.426.1(3) of the Halloween Statute and does not affect the validity of its other sections. Sanderson v. Bailey, 753 F.Supp.3d 773, October 2, 2024 (E.D.Mo.)

-----  
---- end of effective 28 Aug 2008 ----  
use this link to bookmark section 589.426

Click here for the **Reorganization Act of 1974 - or - Concurrent Resolutions Having Force & Effect of Law**

In accordance with Section **3.090**, the language of statutory sections enacted during a legislative session are updated and available on this website on the effective date of such enacted statutory section. ↑

► **Other Information**

► **Other Links**

**BILL NO.** \_\_\_\_\_

**ORDINANCE NO.** \_\_\_\_\_

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD, MISSOURI, AMENDING SECTION 210.1550 TO REMOVE THE SIGN REQUIREMENT.**

**WHEREAS**, the Revised Statutes of Missouri (“RSMo”) Section 589.426 imposes certain restrictions on persons who are required to register as a sexual offender under RSMo Sections 589.400 to 589.425, which includes a requirement that the registered sexual offender post a sign at said offender’s residence on October 31<sup>st</sup> of each year which states “No candy or treats at this residence”; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Chesterfield, Missouri (the “City”) has previously adopted an Ordinance, codified as Section 210.1550, which is identical to RSMo Section 589.426 and allows the City to enforce the provisions of Section 589.426; and

**WHEREAS**, the requirement in RSMo Section 589.426 that a sign must be posted saying “No candy or treats at this residence” was challenged in *Sanderson v. Bailey* and found to be in violation of the First Amendment by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri; and

**WHEREAS**, the decision in *Sanderson v. Bailey* was appealed to the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals which, on January 2, 2026 in *Sanderson v. Hanaway*, upheld the district court’s ruling that the sign requirement in RSMo Section 589.426 facially violates the First Amendment; and

**WHEREAS**, the City Council believes that amending Section 210.1550 based upon the decisions in *Sanderson v. Bailey* and *Sanderson v. Hanaway*, is in the best interests of the health, safety, and welfare of the residents of the City.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD, MISSOURI AS FOLLOWS:**

**Section I:** Section 210.1550 shall be repealed and replaced as follows:

- A. Any person required to register as a sexual offender under Sections 589.400 to 589.425, RSMo., shall be required on October 31<sup>st</sup> of each year to:
1. Avoid all Halloween-related contact with children;
  2. Remain inside his/her residence between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 10:30 P.M. unless required to be elsewhere for just cause, including, but not limited to, employment or medical emergencies;
  3. Leave all outside residential lighting off during the evening hours after 5:00 P.M.

B. Any person required to register as a sexual offender under Sections 589.400 to 589.425, RSMo., who violates the provisions of Subsection (A) of this Section shall be guilty of an ordinance violation.

**Section II:** This ordinance shall be codified within the Municipal Code of the City of Chesterfield.

**Section III:** This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage and approval.

Passed and approved this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2026.

\_\_\_\_\_  
PRESIDING OFFICER

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dan Hurt, MAYOR

ATTEST:

FIRST READING HELD:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vickie McGownd, CITY CLERK

**Amendment**

This Amendment (“Amendment”) is by and between the City of Chesterfield (“Municipality”), and St. Louis County (the “County”).

WHEREAS the County and Municipality are parties to a contract dated executed February 26, 2004, as amended (“Contract”); and

WHEREAS County and Municipality desire to further amend the Contract; and

WHEREAS, by Order dated December 16, 2025, the County Council authorized the application of the daily rate change addressed in this Amendment; and

WHEREAS, Section 606.115 SLCRO authorizes the County Executive to execute this Amendment on behalf of County; and

WHEREAS Ordinance/Resolution \_\_\_\_\_ authorizes Municipality to execute this Amendment;

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the promises and agreements hereinafter set forth, the parties agree as follows:

1. Section 3.1 of the Contract is hereby deleted and the following new Section 3.1 is inserted in its place:

3. COST OF DETENTION

3.1. Municipality shall reimburse County seventy – five dollars (\$75.00) per each twenty-four (24) hour period, or portion thereof, in which an inmate is in the custody of the County Department of Justice Services.

2. All other terms and conditions of the Contract remain in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, County and Municipality have signed this Amendment as of the later of the dates below written.

City of Chesterfield

By \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

I, \_\_\_\_\_, affirm that I am the \_\_\_\_\_ of the City of Chesterfield and that I signed this Amendment on behalf of said Municipality. I acknowledge this Amendment to be the free act and deed of said Municipality.

St. Louis County, Missouri

\_\_\_\_\_  
County Executive

Date Executed by County: \_\_\_\_\_

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Administrative Director

Approved:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Director of Justice Services

Approved as to legal form:

\_\_\_\_\_  
St. Louis County Counselor

Approved:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Accounting Officer

Legal Review: \_\_\_\_\_

CE Review: \_\_\_\_\_

## CITY ATTORNEY MEMORANDUM

**Date:** January 29, 2026  
**To:** Mike Geisel, City Administrator  
**From:** Christopher B. Graville, City Attorney  
**Subject:** Authority of City to Regulate Self-Driving Cars

---

The City currently has the authority to regulate unmanned self-driving cars<sup>1</sup> (herein “Fully Autonomous Vehicles”), however, pending legislation in the Missouri legislature would prohibit political subdivisions from regulating fully autonomous vehicles, automated driving systems, or on-demand autonomous vehicle networks.

In April of 2025, the United States Department of Transportation and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration introduced a new Automated Vehicle Framework. This Automated Vehicle Framework was introduced as the first step to “slash red tape and move us closer to a single national standard that spurs innovation and prioritizes safety.” Nonetheless, the Automated Vehicle Framework does not prohibit states or their political subdivisions from regulating Fully Autonomous Vehicles and has delegated these decisions to the States.

In December of 2025, Missouri lawmakers introduced two identical bills in the Missouri House and Senate which would regulate Fully Autonomous Vehicles, House Bill No. 2069 and Senate Bill No. 1050 (the “Prefilled Legislation”). The Prefilled Legislation would prevent political subdivisions, including the City, from regulating Fully Autonomous Vehicles. While these are just prefilled bills, due to the lack of any current Missouri legislation on Fully Autonomous Vehicles<sup>2</sup>, we anticipate that some form of regulation will pass during the 2026 legislative session. Based on the State’s recent history of preempting political subdivisions on emerging technologies (e.g. RSMo 304.900, limiting the ability of political subdivisions to regulate autonomous delivery vehicles that operate only on sidewalks and crosswalks), the City may wish to defer consideration of any regulations on Fully Autonomous Vehicles until after the current legislative session.

If the City Council desires to adopt an ordinance regulating Fully Autonomous Vehicles, I would ask that the item first be placed on a Public Health and Safety agenda for discussion of what methods or aspects of Fully Autonomous Vehicles they want to regulate.

---

<sup>1</sup> This phrase has been interpreted to mean vehicles which are capable of operation without a driver but not including vehicles where the vehicle still requires a driver behind the wheel. Based on this interpretation, the phrase unmanned vehicles would appear to apply to vehicles in categories four and five of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration levels of automation chart. A copy of this chart can be located at: <https://www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.gov/files/2022-05/Level-of-Automation-052522-tag.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> In 2021 Missouri adopted regulations on “Personal Delivery Devices” which could operate autonomously on sidewalks and crosswalks, but not on any roadway. *See* RSMo 304.900. A copy of our 2021 memorandum on Personal Delivery Devices can be provided upon request.

# HOUSE BILL NO. 2208

## 103RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY

---

INTRODUCED BY REPRESENTATIVE MAYHEW.

5149H.011

JOSEPH ENGLER, Chief Clerk

---

### AN ACT

To amend chapter 304, RSMo, by adding thereto nine new sections relating to autonomous vehicles.

---

*Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the state of Missouri, as follows:*

Section A. Chapter 304, RSMo, is amended by adding thereto nine new sections, to  
2 be known as sections 304.920, 304.923, 304.926, 304.927, 304.928, 304.929, 304.930,  
3 304.931, and 304.932, to read as follows:

**304.920. As used in sections 304.920 to 304.932, the following terms mean:**

- 2       **(1) "Automated driving system", the hardware and software that are collectively**  
3 **capable of performing the entire dynamic driving task on a sustained basis, regardless**  
4 **of whether it is limited to a specific operational design domain;**  
5       **(2) "Dynamic driving task", all of the real-time operational and tactical**  
6 **functions required to operate a vehicle in on-road traffic, excluding the strategic**  
7 **functions such as trip scheduling and selection of destinations and way points, and**  
8 **including, but not limited to:**  
9       **(a) Lateral vehicle motion control via steering;**  
10       **(b) Longitudinal motion control via acceleration and deceleration;**  
11       **(c) Monitoring the driving environment via object and event detection,**  
12 **recognition, classification, and response preparation;**  
13       **(d) Object and event response execution;**  
14       **(e) Maneuver planning; and**  
15       **(f) Enhancing conspicuity via lighting, signaling, and gesturing;**

EXPLANATION — Matter enclosed in bold-faced brackets ~~thus~~ in the above bill is not enacted and is intended to be omitted from the law. Matter in **bold-face** type in the above bill is proposed language.

16 (3) "Dynamic driving task fallback", the response by the person or human  
17 driver to either perform the dynamic driving task or achieve a minimal risk condition  
18 after occurrence of a dynamic driving task performance-relevant system failure or  
19 failures or upon operational design domain exit, or the response by an automated  
20 driving system to achieve minimal risk condition, given the same circumstances;

21 (4) "Fully autonomous vehicle", a motor vehicle equipped with an automated  
22 driving system designed to function without a human driver as a level 4 or level 5 system  
23 under SAE J3016B;

24 (5) "Human driver", a natural person in the vehicle with a valid license to  
25 operate a motor vehicle who controls all or part of the dynamic driving task;

26 (6) "Minimal risk condition", a condition to which a person, human driver, or an  
27 automated driving system may bring a vehicle after performing the dynamic driving  
28 task fallback in order to reduce the risk of a crash when a given trip cannot or should  
29 not be completed;

30 (7) "On-demand autonomous vehicle network", a transportation service  
31 network that uses a software application or other digital means to dispatch or  
32 otherwise enable the prearrangement of transportation with fully autonomous vehicles  
33 for purposes of transporting passengers or goods, including for-hire transportation and  
34 transportation of passengers or goods for compensation;

35 (8) "Operational design domain", operating conditions under which a given  
36 automated driving system is specifically designed to function including, but not limited  
37 to, environmental, geographical, and time-of-day restrictions, or the requisite presence  
38 or absence of certain traffic or roadway characteristics;

39 (9) "Request to intervene", notification by an automated driving system to a  
40 human driver that the human driver should promptly begin or resume performance of  
41 part or all of the dynamic driving task;

42 (10) "SAE J3016B", the "Taxonomy and Definitions for Terms Related to  
43 Driving Automation Systems for On-Road Motor Vehicles", published by SAE  
44 International in June 2018.

304.923. 1. A person may operate a fully autonomous vehicle on the public roads  
2 of this state without a human driver, provided that the automated driving system is  
3 engaged and the vehicle meets the following conditions:

4 (1) If a failure of the automated driving system occurs that renders the system  
5 unable to perform the entire dynamic driving task relevant to its intended operational  
6 design domain, the fully autonomous vehicle will achieve a minimal risk condition;

7 (2) The fully autonomous vehicle is capable of operating in compliance with the  
8 applicable traffic and motor vehicle safety laws and regulations of this state when

9 reasonable to do so unless an exemption has been granted by the department of public  
10 safety;

11 (3) When required by federal law, the vehicle bears the required manufacturer's  
12 certification label indicating that at the time of its manufacture it has been certified to  
13 be in compliance with all applicable Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards, including  
14 reference to any exemption granted by the National Highway Traffic Safety  
15 Administration.

16 2. Prior to operating a fully autonomous vehicle on the public roads of this state  
17 without a human driver, a person shall submit a law enforcement plan to the  
18 department of public safety that describes:

19 (1) How to communicate with a fleet support specialist who is available during  
20 the times the vehicle is in operation;

21 (2) How to safely remove the fully autonomous vehicle from the roadway and  
22 steps to safely tow the vehicle;

23 (3) How to recognize whether the fully autonomous is in autonomous mode; and

24 (4) Any additional information the manufacturer or owner deems necessary  
25 regarding hazardous conditions or public safety risks associated with the operation of  
26 the fully autonomous vehicle.

304.926. 1. When an automated driving system installed on a motor vehicle is  
2 engaged:

3 (1) The automated driving system is considered the driver or operator, for the  
4 purpose of assessing compliance with applicable traffic or motor vehicle laws and shall  
5 be deemed to satisfy electronically all physical acts required by a driver or operator of  
6 the vehicle; and

7 (2) The automated driving system is considered to be licensed to operate the  
8 vehicle.

9 2. Before operating a fully autonomous vehicle on public roads in this state  
10 without a human driver, a person shall submit to the department of revenue proof of  
11 financial responsibility, as defined in section 303.020, for the vehicle.

12 3. In the event of a crash:

13 (1) The fully autonomous vehicle shall remain on the scene of the crash when  
14 required under section 303.040, consistent with its capability under section 304.923; and

15 (2) The owner of the fully autonomous vehicle, or a person on behalf of the  
16 vehicle owner, shall report any crashes or collisions consistent with section 303.040.

304.927. An on-demand autonomous vehicle network shall be permitted to  
2 operate pursuant to state laws governing the operation of transportation network  
3 companies, taxis, or any other ground transportation for-hire of passengers, with the

4 exception that any provision of this chapter that reasonably applies only to a human  
5 driver would not apply to the operation of fully autonomous vehicles with the automated  
6 driving system engaged on an on-demand autonomous vehicle network.

304.928. 1. A fully autonomous vehicle shall be properly registered in  
2 accordance with chapter 301. If a fully autonomous vehicle is registered in this state, the  
3 vehicle shall be identified on the registration as a fully autonomous vehicle.

4 2. A fully autonomous vehicle shall be properly titled in accordance with chapter  
5 301. If a fully autonomous vehicle is titled in this state, the vehicle shall be identified on  
6 the title as a fully autonomous vehicle.

304.929. 1. A person may operate a motor vehicle equipped with an automated  
2 driving system capable of performing the entire dynamic driving task if:

3 (1) Such automated driving system will issue a request to intervene whenever the  
4 automated driving system is not capable of performing the entire dynamic driving task  
5 with the exception that the person will respond appropriately to such a request; and

6 (2) The automated driving system is capable of being operated in compliance  
7 with this chapter when reasonable to do so unless an exemption has been granted by the  
8 department of public safety.

9 2. Nothing in sections 304.920 to 304.932 prohibits or restricts a human driver  
10 from operating a fully autonomous vehicle equipped with controls that allow for the  
11 human driver to control all or part of the dynamic driving task.

304.930. A fully autonomous vehicle that is also a commercial vehicle as defined  
2 in section 301.010 may operate pursuant to state laws governing the operation of  
3 commercial motor vehicles, except that any provision that by its nature reasonably  
4 applies only to a human driver does not apply to such a vehicle operating with the  
5 automated driving system engaged.

304.931. A fully autonomous vehicle that is designed to be operated exclusively  
2 by the automated driving system for all trips is not subject to motor vehicle equipment  
3 laws or regulations of this state that:

4 (1) Relate to or support motor vehicle operation by a human driver seated in the  
5 vehicle; and

6 (2) Are not relevant to an automated driving system.

304.932. 1. Unless otherwise provided in this chapter and notwithstanding any  
2 other provision of law, fully autonomous vehicles and automated driving systems are  
3 governed exclusively by sections 304.920 to 304.932. The director of the department of  
4 public safety may promulgate rules necessary to implement these sections. The  
5 department shall be the sole agency that may implement the provisions of these sections.  
6 Any rule or portion of a rule, as that term is defined in section 536.010 that is created

7 under the authority delegated in this section shall become effective only if it complies  
8 with and is subject to all of the provisions of chapter 536 and, if applicable, section  
9 536.028. This section and chapter 536 are nonseverable and if any of the powers vested  
10 with the general assembly pursuant to chapter 536 to review, to delay the effective date,  
11 or to disapprove and annul a rule are subsequently held unconstitutional, then the grant  
12 of rulemaking authority and any rule proposed or adopted after August 28, 2026, shall  
13 be invalid and void.

14 **2. No state agency, political subdivision, municipality, or local entity shall**  
15 **prohibit the operation of fully autonomous vehicles, automated driving systems, or on-**  
16 **demand autonomous vehicle networks, or otherwise enact or keep in force rules or**  
17 **ordinances that would impose taxes, fees, or other requirements, including performance**  
18 **standards, specific to the operation of fully autonomous vehicles, automated driving**  
19 **systems, or on-demand autonomous vehicle networks in addition to the requirements of**  
20 **sections 304.920 to 304.932.**

✓



# Chesterfield Police Memorandum



---

Date: 1/8/2026

To: Michael Geisel, City Administrator

From: Chief Cheryl Funkhouser *Cheryl Funkhouser*

RE: Elementary School Resource Officers (ESROs) – Pilot Program

---

The purpose of this memorandum is to recommend a pilot program related to the staffing of the Elementary School Resource Officer (ESRO) position within the Police department. Currently, the ESRO position within our agency is filled with Police Officers that have been reassigned from the Patrol function of the agency. We have found in the past that filling these positions have been challenging, not only due to manpower shortages within our Patrol Division, but also due to low interest from staff members to fill the positions. Frankly, the assignment and the prospect of being relegated to spending an entire workday inside an educational facility goes against the appeal of “crime fighting” that attract many individuals to the Law Enforcement profession. However, I believe that the role of the ESRO is a valuable one in our profession. Recognizing the importance of the role and the challenges we face in filling the role, required my staff and I to use innovative ideas to create a solution to this issue. One solution that we identified would be to create a new program within the Police department to allow the ESRO position to be filled with individuals that would be specifically hired to perform that work. Therefore, instead of reassigning someone who had been hired as a Patrol Officer to work as an ESRO, our agency would actively advertise a job opening through the use of public hiring resources such as *Indeed* and local news publications to hire an individual to serve as an ESRO.

To further define this program, in order to qualify for the position, individuals would have to be certified through the Missouri Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) program, just like our current police officers. However, unlike our current police officers who are required to work rotating shifts and be subject to doing so regardless of their designated assignment (for example Detectives are still required to work rotating shifts if/when manpower levels require it), the ESROs would not be required to do so. Instead, their sole responsibilities would be to work within the schools during the school year and to work Park patrol functions and assignments during the times when school is not in session.

I anticipate that this program will attract candidates who are experienced police officers that desire a more stable schedule, as opposed to working rotating shifts. In addition, we have found that similar roles in the community, such as the Rockwood School District’s School Safety Officer program, attract officers who are nearing retirement age, or have reached retirement age, and desire these positions as a way to earn an income while collecting retirement from a previous employer. The individuals are often looking for a way to stay involved in police work without having to work rotating shifts. The advantage is that these employees often have numerous years of law enforcement experience and training, and are also well trained in dealing with the public.

Due to this being a new concept not just for our agency, but regional Law Enforcement in general, the uncertainty surrounding the success of this program is a concern. Therefore, it is my recommendation that the program be

tried as a pilot program in our agency for the period of one year, and evaluated after that time period to determine whether or not the program be implemented on a more permanent basis. Due to the fact that this program was not budgeted for in the 2026 budget, for the time period of the pilot program only, we could use the allotted salary for one of our current Police Officer vacancies. However, if the program is successful and the City decides to adopt the program full time, I would request that the position be included in the next budget cycle and the Police Officer position that was “frozen” for the pilot program be redefined to be included in the normal authorized staffing levels for the Police department.

In addition, to further define this role, the City should consider offering this role at a salary lower than the current starting Police Officer salary. For example, I believe that a salary of \$ 61,000.00 - \$ 62,000.00 per year would be a competitive rate as compared to the current salary being paid to School Safety Officers in the Rockwood School District. However, it is my recommendation that, regardless of the salary chosen, this position be offered as a full-time position, having the same benefits of any other full-time position within the City, to ensure that the best quality of applicant is attracted for the position.

I realize that this concept may be outside of the norm, so I imagine that you may have additional questions or concerns about this recommendation. I look forward to discussing this recommendation with you.

Excellent approach and creative. Please forward to the next PH&S Committee for their consideration.

A couple of important notes:

- 1) Pilot program, to be reviewed at end of year.
- 2) With current vacancies, unlikely to reach full employment in 2026, no budget amendment is necessary at this time. However, if/when full employment is achieved, this will increase authorized headcount.

2026-1-14

