

**MINUTES OF LAYTON CITY
COUNCIL WORK MEETING**

MAY 21, 2020; 5:31 P.M.

**MAYOR AND COUNCILMEMBERS
PRESENT:**

**MAYOR JOY PETRO, ZACH BLOXHAM, TOM
DAY, DAWN FITZPATRICK, CLINT MORRIS,
AND DAVE THOMAS**

STAFF PRESENT:

**ALEX JENSEN, GARY CRANE, TRACY
PROBERT, CHAD WILKINSON, LON CROWELL,
TERRY COBURN, STEPHEN JACKSON, DAVID
PRICE, MICHELLE HOWARD, AND KIM READ**

The meeting was held in the Council Chambers of the Layton City Center.

Mayor Petro opened the meeting and turned the time over to Staff.

AGENDA:

**UPDATE – COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) COVID-19 CARES ACT
ALLOCATIONS**

Mayor Petro informed the Council she and Councilmember Morris had been invited to review the applications with Staff.

Lon Crowell, Economic Development Manager, announced 24 applications had been received from individuals/businesses which qualified for the CDBG grant funding. He distributed a handout which reflected the companies which had applied, the totals and current remaining balance of funds. He reported there were some applicants which weren't approved to receive funding and indicated those were identified at the bottom of the handout. He pointed out the most common reason for denial was the household income limit exceeded the allowable amount designated by HUD.

Mr. Crowell mentioned one question put forth by the committee was whether applications submitted by a Layton City business but which the owner wasn't a Layton resident should be considered. He indicated those businesses could be identified on the handout. He asked if there were any questions.

Mayor Petro pointed out there was still available grant funding and suggested the Council could consider those applications. Chad Wilkinson, Community and Economic Development Director, reported Staff had verified with HUD whether those businesses could be recipients and stated it had indicated that would be allowed. Mayor Petro pointed out Layton City residents employed by a business located in Layton, but which the business owner lived outside of Layton had automatically been denied the opportunity to receive the grant funding.

Councilmember Bloxham asked if some of these businesses were franchised and Mr. Crowell responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember Fitzpatrick clarified the City was still accepting applications and Mr. Crowell responded in the affirmative. Councilmember Day asked how long the City would continue to accept applications and Mr. Crowell responded applications would be accepted as long as there were available funds. Mr. Wilkinson added the City could quickly grant the funding and indicated the City was anticipating an influx of requests in the Fall.

A discussion took place regarding the applications and the grant funding. Councilmember Day asked if

other cities were providing similar grant funding that these business owners might receive. Mr. Crowell indicated Davis County didn't have a grant program at this time and wasn't aware whether Clearfield, another entitlement City, had implemented a similar program. Mayor Petro pointed out if the owner applied for the grant funding with the City in which it lived, in addition to applying for grant funding with Layton, where the business was located, it would be violation of HUD's rules and wouldn't be allowed to "double dip".

Councilmember Thomas expressed his opinion the grant funding would benefit the business whether or not the owner lived in Layton and stated he wouldn't want any business to close. The Council was in favor of approving grant funding for Layton businesses in which the owners weren't Layton residents, to be distributed to its employees residing in Layton.

DISCUSSION – PROPOSED CHANGES TO FARM ANIMAL REGULATIONS

Mr. Wilkinson explained the City recently received a code enforcement complaint about ducks and informed the Council the City's current ordinance didn't allow for ducks. He added City ordinance only allow for chickens on single family residential lots. He reported the resident submitted an application, which was allowed by law, proposing a change to the ordinance to allow ducks just as it did chickens. He added the request was to reduce the minimum lot size requirements for both chickens and ducks, as the applicant's lot was smaller than what the current ordinance allowed for chickens.

He reported Staff had completed analysis considering all impacts and forwarded the proposal to the Planning Commission. He indicated the Planning Commission reviewed the proposal during its meeting on Tuesday, May 12, 2020, and it recommended approval with some substantial changes to the ordinance.

He explained substantial changes would be made to the ordinance and reviewed them with the Council. He reported if the ordinance allowed birds on smaller lots, fewer birds would be allowed and explained the reduction for the smaller lots would be from six to five fowl, on an 8,000 square foot lot. He added the number of birds would be determined by the square footage of the lot and explained the formula used to determine the allowable number.

He reported another major change was related to the size of the coop/pens in addition to an increase in the setbacks, which would be more restrictive. He emphasized those changes hadn't been reflected in the Planning Commission's recommendation and stated the Council would need to discuss those two issues. He asked if there any questions.

Councilmember Thomas requested clarification on restricting the size of the enclosure to a maximum 120 square feet. Mr. Wilkinson explained the formula used by Staff to determine the "reasonable" size for the property and indicated illustrations could be provided and a discussion took place.

Mayor Petro asked about the difference between 8,000 square foot lots and lots in the R-1-6 classification. Mr. Wilkinson explained a resident with an R-1-6 lot that met that minimum lot size, would allow for chickens and emphasized the size of the lot would determine the allowance as opposed to zoning classification. He mentioned this could be applicable to a corner lot or cul-de-sac. Mayor Petro expressed concern with those circumstances as there might be only one or two lots in a subdivision which could qualify for that allowance.

Councilmember Fitzpatrick asked about the difference between domesticated ducks and wild ducks and expressed her opinion the City shouldn't encourage the keeping of wild ducks. Mr. Wilkinson responded there were certain breeds of ducks which didn't fly and were considered domesticated ducks. Councilmember Fitzpatrick requested clarification about the requirement of obtaining a permit and Mr. Wilkinson responded permits weren't required for zones with an agriculture allowance.

Alex Jensen, City Manager, asked if the regulation would be based on zoning or size of the lot and requested clarification whether the City would be changing its standard in approving the proposed

ordinance. He pointed out the current ordinance was based on the zoning designation and if it was changed to square footage there would be a lot of questions from the public.

Councilmember Day asked about rabbits and other animals. Mr. Wilkinson responded the proposed text amendment wasn't Staff driven and the City hadn't received application to include rabbits or other animals and indicated this request was specific to ducks; therefore, Staff wasn't prepared to consider other changes. Mayor Petro suggested since the Council had been asked to make adjustments to animal regulations, maybe all other farm animals should be considered as well. Mr. Wilkinson emphasized this was an application submitted by a resident and Staff had only prepared the text amendment confined to the application.

Councilmember Bloxham requested clarification about the City's responsibility once the text amendment application was received and Mr. Wilkinson responded Staff was obligated to bring the request before the Council. He read the Code specific to residential chickens and pointed out chickens were allowed in the R-1-6 zone consisting of 10,000 square feet. Councilmember Thomas asked about the precedent in modifying the City's animal regulation ordinance and Mr. Wilkinson suggested each separate request should be considered individually and a discussion followed.

Councilmember Fitzpatrick pointed out duck eggs were a food product and suggested that should be considered in the proposed text amendment. She also asked about the size of the coop and Mr. Wilkinson responded Staff would be proposing changes to the coop at a later date.

Councilmember Morris asked why pigs weren't identified as a farm animal on the list and Mr. Wilkinson stated they were addressed in another section of the code. Mr. Jensen clarified Staff was bringing it forth out of an application to the City and the issue was up to the Council to either kill the proposed text amendment or approve an ordinance it was comfortable with. He suggested the relationship between people and animals had changed over time and believed the City would be receiving other requests and the discussion continued.

DISCUSSION – PARKS AND RECREATION TRANSITION TO YELLOW PHASE

David Price, Parks & Recreation Director, distributed a handout and stated there were some changes from the last discussion based on the governor's recommendations transitioning to yellow phase due to the COVID-19 Pandemic.

He reviewed the following guidelines specific to Parks:

- Playgrounds and rest rooms had already been opened to the public at the Council's request.
- Staff was prepared to open the outdoor courts and skate park based on the governor's recommendation.
- The swimming pool and splash pad openings were being directed by City leaders and would be discussed further in the meeting.

He referred to the general guidelines specific to Recreation:

- He pointed out if there was a City event taking place at a City facility, Staff would accept responsibility to manage and control participants and make recommendations for social gathering, etc. He stated this would be applicable to Surf'n Swim and indicated hand sanitizer would be available and participants would be required to follow guidelines identified by both the Governor and City.
- Competition teams and outside agencies using facilities - the organizing body would then become the responsible party to follow guidelines. He indicated this would be applicable to coaches or event organizers to follow. Additionally, they would be responsible to provide a plan to the City identifying how social gathering requirements would be addressed.
- Gymnasiums would move from closed to open for volleyball programming.
- Indoor sports would move to an open status with modifications; hand washing/sanitation before and after team activities, disinfecting of equipment and game balls,

- Outdoor sports and programs would move to an open status with similar modifications.

Mayor Petro asked how implementing some recreation programming at this time could create an overlap of summer sports with fall sports. Michelle Howard, Recreation Supervisor, responded all cancelled spring sports such as softball and baseball would not be reconsidered; however, summer programming such as tennis, skateboarding and Fit Kids programs would begin, followed by football. Mayor Petro asked about Arts in the Park and Ms. Howard responded that particular program would be cancelled. She added Staff didn't believe it could effectively manage the program specific to the social distancing and sanitation requirements given the age of participants and so much shared equipment.

Mr. Price directed the Council to the competition teams field use and rental and reported Staff recommended opening the fields allowing outside agencies to use the facilities and deferring the responsibility to appropriately manage their programs accordingly with recommended guidelines.

Mr. Price announced the City would like to review special event requests on a case by case basis and a discussion pertaining to liability and insurance requirements. Mr. Price emphasized City Staff would clean and sanitize rest room facilities every day. Mr. Price indicated use of the amphitheater would be managed the same as special events.

He reported Staff was recommending to open the wave pool and splash pad with modifications: separate entrances/exits at Surf'n Swim, social distancing on the pool decks and at the splash pad. He explained this amount of time would provide appropriate time to recruit and train lifeguards. He reminded the Council lap swim/aerobics had been open with reservations and announced it would also move to a more open environment allowing more participants in the water. He announced swimming lessons would again be offered, however, the groups would be smaller. He indicated the swim team would continue to swim.

Mr. Price stated the museum would continue to operate by appointment only. He reported Mr. Sanders, Museum Curator, had submitted his resignation with a date of June 30, 2020. He indicated Staff was beginning the recruitment process.

Councilmember Morris asked if the lifeguards would have the responsibility to enforce social distancing on the pool decks and Mr. Price responded in the affirmative. He pointed out there was always an adequate adult in either the pool manager or assistant pool manager to support the lifeguard staff to enforce the requirements.

Mayor Petro clarified the Davis Arts Council would work with Staff regarding the Amphitheater and Mr. Price responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember Morris asked about the youth football program and Mr. Price indicated the WFFL (Wasatch Front Football League) was considering different modifications which could allow a program to take place. He indicated the City was also watching what the high schools would implement in order for a program to take place. He stated if it was determined the program could safely take place, the City would not be providing bleachers along the sidelines. He also explained what had been discussed and would be proposed specific to spring sports in 2021, if the Pandemic was still present. A discussion followed regarding regulations and compliance of visitors.

There were no objections from the Council regarding the Plan.

Mr. Price announced Governor Herbert had signed a Proclamation designating Sunday, May 24, 2020, Centennial Day for Layton City and indicated the City received a video of Governor Herbert reading and signing the Proclamation. Mr. Price asked if the Council was interested in participating in a short video introducing the Proclamation prior to the video being released to the public and a discussion took place.

Ms. Howard reported Staff had compiled a nice slide show which would lead into the Governor signing the Proclamation. Mayor Petro stated she would consult individually with each councilmember and report

back to recreation Staff.

Councilmember Morris expressed his opinion the City had responded appropriately in complying with Governor Herbert's phased response to the COVID-19 Pandemic suggested Staff move into the "yellow phase" as soon as possible since it had been announced on Saturday, May 16, 2020, and the discussion continued.

Mayor Petro announced the Council was in support of Staffs' recommendations to move forward to the "yellow" phase.

COUNCIL MEMBER REPORT

Mayor Petro called for any updates.

Councilmember Thomas inquired about the Centennial Store and suggested each councilmember advertise the Centennial Store. Mayor Petro explained in addition to the celebration, there was an online store which residents could visit to purchase different items and requested the councilmembers promote the store. She stated the commemorative coin was available.

Mayor Petro reviewed the following:

- COG (Council of Government) meeting – UTA (Utah Transit Authority) had changed bus and train schedules from every 15 minutes to every 30 minutes and reported ridership had significantly decreased. She reported the peak ridership was being experienced during the noon or lunch hour time compared to rush hour times.
- Jeff Oliver, Davis County, reported over 20 applications were received totaling \$60 million for the third quarter gas tax. She announced Layton City had submitted applications for some projects.
- No report from the Davis County Health Department would take place on Monday, May 25, 2020, since it was a holiday and announced it would report on Tuesday instead. She stated Davis County had 12 new cases within four days and expressed concern with the increase. She indicated Layton City had a total of 84 cases, equivalent to 33.63%, which was fourth in the County. She stated Clearfield City was second and suggested the City was doing well.
- North Davis Sewer District was in need of a new line to take water out to the Great Salt Lake and the Board just passed the cost to pipe the water out to Gilbert Bay, further north and west of Farmington Bay. She reported the cost had a substantial price tag but everyone involved believed it was needed to accommodate for future growth.
- Wasatch Integrated announced the transfer station was in the test phase and would soon be operational as soon as June. She reported the Board had voted to move forward in transferring waste to Tekoi, a facility located in Tooele County and operated by Waste Management, due to the potential cost savings, as opposed to the Utah County facility which Waste Management had interest in.

There were no other reports.

BUDGET DISCUSSION

Tracy Probert, Finance Director, reminded the Council it had requested further discussion regarding the Water Master Plan and Rate Study. He announced he would review the Rate Study following the Water Master Plan review by Stephen Jackson, City Engineer

Mr. Jackson explained the previous Water Master Plan had been completed in 2008 and it was recommended these be updated every five years based on major factors. He stated one of these major reasons for an updated plan were that the Impact Fee laws had substantially changed, which required the City to update its Impact Fees Facilities Plan and Analysis and explained the parameters with how the City could use those funds. He indicated another law had recently been established which required public

water systems within the state adopt a conservation rate structure, a tiered system which encouraged users to conserve water based on usage and consumption. He reported this required the City to reconsider its fees and its rates in order to be compliant. He mentioned the Study also considered future projects and infrastructure and indicated the impact to Weber Basin Water affected users within the City, since the City purchased some water from that entity.

He stated the following items were considered in the Water Master Plan and reviewed them:

- Existing water system
- Supply and demand projects
- Peak supply and demand
- Distribution system evaluation
- Recommended system improvements
 - 10 year capital facilities plan
 - Impact fee analysis
 - Rate study

He reported the City had a very robust water system and reviewed its existing statistics to illustrate the substantial investment in the infrastructure. He pointed out the City's water system rarely experienced issues and complimented the City's Public Works Department. He reviewed the following:

- 296 miles of pipe – 4" to 24" in diameter, which consisted of more miles of pipe than roads
- 15 storage tanks – 22.3 million gallons of water
- 8 pump stations – 8,750 gallons per minute
- 5 wells – 8,200 gallons per minute
- 8 WBWCD (Weber Basin Water Conservancy District) connections
- 51 pressure reducing valves
- Estimated system value at \$265 Million

He shared an illustration which identified the existing demand for water, as well as the demand at buildout. He also identified culinary water projects and reviewed some of them with the Council pointing out the City had appropriate and adequate infrastructure and didn't have to limit development when opportunities were presented such as the new IHC (Intermountain Healthcare) hospital.

Alex Jensen, City Manager, emphasized Staff's perspective was to maintain the current system with an effective rate structure. He explained the City had long term contracts with Weber Basin Water to purchase water and shared the amount of those costs. He pointed out future purchases of water from Willard Bay or Bear River would be very expensive and suggested the City was well positioned to have access to water without the need for future expensive water, because of great management and because of the wells. He believed some cities will be in a difficult situation in the future, in terms of costs, when required to purchase the expensive water.

Terry Coburn, Public Works Director, reported there were some neighboring cities which strictly relied on Weber Basin Water Conservancy District as its water source.

Mr. Jackson reviewed the proposed pipe improvements with the Council and pointed out the top two projects were in the process of being completed and a discussion followed. He pointed out the Fire Department indicated the City had received an ISO (Insurance Services Office) rating of "2", the highest ranking available, specific to fire flow.

Mr. Coburn reported the water ratings for Layton City and pointed out how these ratings benefitted residents with lower homeowner's insurance premiums and believed the City's public works infrastructure contributed to the positive reputation of Layton City.

He reviewed the proposed storage and pump improvements, secondary water project improvements and those projected costs with the Council. He emphasized the Impact Fees and Rate Analysis conformed to the new state laws and announced the City was compliant with all requirements. A discussion continued

regarding the proposed pipe projects in relation to development.

Mr. Jackson shared the Financial Coverage Projections with the Council identified by Zions Public Finance and a discussion followed.

Councilmember Day asked whether the City was in line, falling behind, or ahead, with the implementation of previous rate increases. Mr. Probert responded the City was right where it was anticipated to be and shared an illustration of projections provided by Zions Finance and a discussion followed. He pointed out information identified in the Rate Study, at that time, indicated the need for the three-years of rate increases approved by the prior Council.

Councilmember Day inquired whether the figures from the two previous rate increases put the City where it needed to be and whether the third increase was warranted. Mr. Probert responded he had figures from last fall which reflected the model of what the City needed to bring in and reported the City was approximately ahead by five percent for the year. He announced the City would complete additional analysis this fall to identify conservation and whether the figures justified the final increase. He pointed out the City would need adequate revenue for projects and conservation could be detrimental to recognized revenue. Councilmember Day emphasized he wanted to see how the projects had matched up with revenue and whether it appeared the City had adequate revenue to complete the identified projects for this next year. Mr. Jensen mentioned those had been identified in the Capital Improvement Plan and indicated the tracking of projects and costs was an ongoing process. Mr. Jackson reported there was some cost savings associated with the construction of the new water tank and believed it was possible to complete the project under the bid amount. He explained how the cost savings had been recognized and a discussion followed.

Mr. Probert stated in addition to updating the Council in the fall regarding water revenue based on the rate structure, Staff would provide a list of identified projects and proposed funding to help determine whether the last installation of the rate increases of 10% was needed. He believed the City would be within five percent of estimated figures and anticipated the City would continue to be on schedule as the model had reflected. He pointed out complaints could be made that due to the rate increase, residents cut back on consumption, and the City continued to raise the rates, and indicated that was part of the model; residents needed to conserve and use less water, however, the City still needed to operate, maintain and improve the System.

Councilmember Morris suggested an educational component would be beneficial and Mr. Jensen responded the City had attempted to educate residents and explained the City's philosophy associated with increasing water rates; the City would never ask for more than what was actually needed. He informed the Council the consultant had suggested a much steeper curve in the rates and projects and Staff dismissed the suggestion. Councilmember Morris expressed concern in waiting for the fall until an analysis could be completed and believed the City had no choice but to raise water rates based on the need to complete the identified projects.

Mayor Petro explained her philosophy in approving the rate structure when this plan was originally presented to the prior City Council. Mr. Probert pointed out the previous Council had already adopted this rate structure and the current Council could move forward with implementation; however, as a courtesy, Staff believed the analysis should be presented to the current Council to justify the projects and rate increase.

Councilmember Fitzpatrick suggested the City consider implementing changes to its landscaping requirements to encourage conservation since water wasn't an unlimited resource. Mr. Jensen responded the City had implemented conservation components, set by the State of Utah, with its water rates and pointed out Weber Basin provided free analysis to residents.

Mr. Jackson reported the average resident was using more water on "landscaping" than required and spoke to the different education components being considered by Weber Basin. He shared some examples

and a discussion followed. Mr. Jensen pointed out the City's structure, even with conservation tiers, wasn't designed to punish a reasonable water user.

Mr. Probert reviewed the culinary water projection and cash balance analysis with the Council and emphasized the City didn't price the system based on other municipalities pricing; it was priced on what was needed to operate the system. He shared figures which were studied last fall to analyze the water revenue which reflected the City was still in the bottom third compared to other municipalities for the base rate. A discussion took place regarding the disparity in comparing base rates from city to city.

Mr. Probert reviewed the Cash Balance Analysis with the Council and pointed out it was modeled so that the rate increases didn't result in excessive amounts of cash on hand which identified the 5.88% difference between generated water revenue and projected water revenue, which justified the increase. Mr. Jensen pointed out the fairness and equity associated with water rates/revenue for residents with and without secondary water. Mr. Probert reviewed the respective water rate tiers and also explained how the tiered structure had been adjusted by Staff to allow for reasonable usage and costs.

Mr. Jackson pointed out the City currently used 251 gallons, per capita, per day, which was the baseline from 2015, and informed the Council the State had set a goal for the City to be at 200 gallons by 2030, which was a 20% reduction. He pointed out the proposed figures for 2040 and 2065 and believed it would be a challenge to make that happen. He also mentioned the costs incurred by irrigation companies in the form of metering used to track usage. Mr. Jensen added once there was a rate structure implemented with the metering of secondary water, residents would quickly learn to conserve.

The Council took a break at 7:52 p.m.

The meeting resumed at 8:01 p.m.

Mr. Probert reviewed the timeline specific to adoption of the budget and recommended the City not proceed through Truth in Taxation unless it was considering a property tax increase and a discussion followed. Mr. Jensen mentioned the Council had expressed its intent to do this as part of its fiduciary responsibility in adopting a budget; however, he believed the public wouldn't appreciate the Council's position due to the Covid-19 Pandemic.

He reviewed the Sales Tax figures from the State which was better than anticipated, given the pandemic crisis, and reviewed it with the Council comparing to last year's figures. He pointed out the increase of almost of \$115,000, which surprised City Staff and Elected Officials. He reviewed Sales Tax figures specific to March for the different markets and Sales Tax projections with the Council.

Mr. Probert reviewed the proposed expenditure picture based on a 10% reduction in Sales Tax with the Council and a discussion took place. Mr. Jensen pointed out Staff would work to identify budget items which could be cut or delayed due to the uncertainty of Sales Tax Revenue. He emphasized the City would continue to maintain healthy fund balances in order to avoid putting the City in a position which would take three or four years to recover and pointed out this had been the City's philosophy during difficult financial times. A discussion took place relating to the City's health insurance plan for employees and Mr. Jensen stated Staff wouldn't be recommending an increase to the employees this year and reviewed the tools available to the employees in reducing pharmaceutical costs.

Mr. Probert requested direction from the Council specific to the Street Lighting Fund and reminded the Council it had been discussed during several meetings. He pointed out doing away with this fund and reverting it back to the General Fund wouldn't be reasonable and would require a property tax increase. He expressed his opinion it was an essential utility and the proposed \$2 rate increase would result in a positive fund balance, accomplishing the needed result. He reviewed the formula used to determine the fee for commercial properties. He also reviewed the utility rate increases with the Council. He asked if there any questions.

Mayor Petro asked what the impact to the resident would be if adopted and Mr. Probert responded it

would be anywhere between \$2.60 to \$4.60. A discussion took place regarding the Street Lighting Fund with each councilmember expressing their respective desire associated with the fee. The Council directed Staff to implement the \$2 rate increase, as recommended, with an emphasis and focus for older and “dark” areas of the City. Mr. Jackson pointed out in addition to the US-89 and West Davis Corridor, UDOT was considering some enhancements to Hill Field Road and the City would be required to pay the difference for the City’s standard light fixtures. Mr. Coburn added UDOT was also looking at Main Street, as well.

A discussion took place specific to sidewalk projects throughout the City and Mr. Jensen explained the process to identify and these types of projects. Councilmember Day expressed his opinion the proposed sidewalk project along West Hill Field Road wasn’t necessary as there was sidewalk along the south side. He also suggested completing the small portion of West Hill Field Road near the railroad tracks behind Sam’s Club. A discussion took place regarding sidewalk projects and Mr. Jackson responded the West Hill Field Road sidewalk project would come to the Council for approval during the City Council scheduled for Thursday, June 4, 2020. A discussion took place regarding improvements along Rosewood Lane.

Mr. Probert shared the 5-Year Summary to Capital Improvement Plan and reviewed the summary of projects identified for this budget year with the Council and shared his recommendations. He also reviewed projects specific to the Enterprise Funds, Prop 1 Funds, and RAMP Funds. Mr. Probert also reviewed Capital Equipment included in the proposed budget.

A discussion took place regarding progress associated with the construction of the West Davis Corridor.

Mayor Petro asked if there were any additional questions. Mr. Jensen indicated Staff would provide an updated budget document to the Council reflecting specific cuts prior to final adoption.

MAYOR’S REPORT

The Mayor’s report was shared earlier in the meeting with the Council Reports.

The meeting adjourned at 9:16 p.m.

Kimberly S Read, City Recorder