

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE HOME RULE CHARTER COMMISSION OF THE
CITY OF NIXA, MISSOURI**

NIXA CITY HALL

July 5th, 2022 6:00 P.M.

The Home Rule Charter Commission meeting was called to order by Chairman Mark Hartsock. Attending Commissioners were Kiri Horne, Ruth-Ann Maynard, David Larsen, Greg Anderson, Karen Keever, Charlotte Stapleton, and Kendal Dingus. The absent Commissioner was Andrew Carl. Attending staff were Jimmy Liles, Cindy Robbins, Nick Woodman, Drew Douglas, and Rebekka Coffey.

Hartsock called for a motion to approve the June 21st, 2022 commission minutes. Dingus made a motion to approve the minutes, with Larsen seconding and all Commissioners voting aye.

Unfinished Business – Article 6 Legal Update and Discussion:

Hartsock provided a background on the previous meeting's discussion about Article 6. Woodman discussed the handouts provided to the commission stating the highlighted sections were additions requested by the commission. Woodman said section 6.2(j) was added per the conversation over Article 6 that was had at the last meeting. Woodman told the commission that if there were issues with giving the authority granted in section 6.2(j) to the Council, it could be delegated to a Chief Municipal Judge.

Keever asked questions about the salary of the municipal judge. Woodman responded that the judge's compensation should be in the Charter, and Council shouldn't have the authority to change the pay during the judge's term. Keever asked if the City is paying the municipal judge until the end of their term, with staff responding yes.

Hartsock stated the City should pay for the judge's salary if the court is moved or consolidated as it is the City's financial burden once the judge has been elected. Discussion followed on the judge's salary and term. The commission asked Woodman his opinion on what the Charter allowed, with Woodman responding. Additional discussion was followed on the judge's salary and term. Dingus asked Woodman about section 6.2(j). Woodman responded that there would be checks and balances to the process contained in 6.2(j) that wouldn't allow the judge to appoint whomever they wanted to the position. Discussion followed about temporarily appointed judges. Larsen asked if the municipal judge would be able to authorize additional judges with the approval of the Council. Woodman responded if there was appropriate language in the Charter, yes, they could as long as there was money in the budget. Anderson asked questions about temporary judges and their qualifications. Hartsock asked if the Commissioners were comfortable with section 6.2(j). All Commissioners agreed that section 6.2(j) was good as presented.

Hartsock discussed the potential for a court review by Council. Hartsock stated that the commission would need to pick a desired time frame for the review to take place. Discussion followed on a potential court review conducted by Council. Woodman provided potential wording for the Charter regarding court reviews. Keever asked specific questions regarding the wording in section 6.1. Woodman responded the wording was pulled from State statutes. Additional discussion was held about a potential court review. Hartsock stated a review every

two (2) years would be too frequent, but a review every four (4) years seemed reasonable. Hartsock asked staff's opinion on a court review every four (4) years, with staff responding that it would be manageable. Anderson asked staff about the City's growth rate, with Liles responding that Nixa is the second (2nd) fastest growing city in the state. Additional discussion followed about potential court reviews. Hartsock called for a vote to approve a four (4) year review of court with all Commissioners voting aye.

Keever asked questions about section 6.3 and if it would be removed. Woodman responded it would be removed due to the comments made by the Office of State Court Administration (OSCA) during the review of the municipal court. Woodman also said removing the section would also allow for there to be no Charter conflict with the State Supreme Court.

Hartsock asked if the commission had any other questions regarding Article 6. Hartsock called for a motion to accept the suggested changes to Article 6 with all Commissioners voting aye. Hartsock thanked Woodman for the work he had done to Article 6. Larsen asked questions about page two (2) of the handout Woodman provided. Larsen stated that page two (2) mentions section 15.2. Hartsock discussed removing (d) from section 15.2 and why it would need to be removed. Hartsock called for a vote to remove section 15.2(d) as it relates to section 6.1, with all Commissioners voting yes. Hartsock stated that a detailed discussion on Article 15 would occur at a later commission meeting.

Keever asked questions regarding section 6.2, with Hartsock and Woodman responding. There was no further discussion on Article 6.

New Business – Detailed Review of Articles 7-9:

Article 7 Discussion: The commission read through sections 7.1(a-b) and 7.2 with no discussion or suggestions. Hartsock stated that a public hearing for these sections would be at the next scheduled meeting.

Article 8 Discussion: The commission read through sections 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4 (a), 8.5 (a-c), 8.6, 8.7(a-d), 8.8, and 8.9 with no discussion or suggestions. Hartsock stated that the public hearing for these sections would be at the next scheduled meeting.

Article 9 Discussion: The commission read through sections 9.1 (a-d) and 9.2 with no discussion or suggestions. The commission read through section 9.3. Hartsock discussed how the City certifies election results verse how other municipalities certify results. Hartsock asked Woodman's opinion on rank choice voting. Woodman stated he had looked at rank choice voting but had not detailed information at this time. Hartsock asked Woodman to bring information on rank choice voting to the next meeting. Woodman provided a brief overview of his rank choice voting information but stated he would bring back further information at the next meeting. Discussion followed on rank choice voting. The commission asked Woodman for detailed information at the next meeting. The commission read through section 9.4. Hartsock stated the City had recently modified the district boundaries. Liles stated the recent change to the district boundaries was due to the decennial census. Woodman said changes have to be made to district boundaries during the decennial census due to state and federal laws. Larsen asked additional

questions about rank choice voting, with Woodman responding. Additional discussion was held on rank choice voting.

Hartsock stated the next meeting would be on August 2nd, 2022 at 6:00 p.m. Hartsock provided an overview of the agenda. Hartsock said there would be a public hearing from 6:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m. over Articles 7-9. Hartsock also said there would be a legal discussion and update over rank choice voting.

Hartsock called for a motion to adjourn at 7:27 p.m. Keever made a motion to adjourn with Anderson seconding and all Commissioners voting aye.

Chairman Hartsock

City Clerk