

**CITY OF SIGOURNEY, IOWA**  
**MINUTES OF SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
**THURSDAY, MAY 12, 2022**

The Sigourney City Council met in special session in the Council Chambers at City Hall on Thursday, May 12, 2022, with Mayor Morlan presiding and the following Council members answering roll call: Isobaker, Lentz, Clark and McLaughlin (*via phone*). Others present were: Emily Wohler (109 East Marion Street Property Owner); Amanda Snakenberg (119 East Marion Street Property Owner); Rod Curtis (Curtis Architecture); Rod Grooms (Façade Grant General Contractor – *via phone*); and Angie Alderson, City Clerk.

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m. Council member McLaughlin moved, seconded by Council member Clark, to approve the tentative agenda. Upon the roll being called, the following voted Ayes: Isobaker, Lentz, Clark and McLaughlin. Nays: None. Motion approved.

Rod Grooms, owner of R.G. Construction, was available to explain the situation with the roofs at 117 and 119 East Marion Street. Mr. Grooms explained his employees were trying to patch up any holes they saw on the roof of 119 East Marion Street. This was to try to minimize any leaking that could take place. The parapet wall was also a culprit in promoting the leaking once the heavy rains came. There was still the leaking even when they put plastic and tarps down. The next step was to try to move forward to getting the roofs on with Hopkins. They were not able to bring their materials up the parapets due to the structural condition of them. They were not able to put roofs on those two (*buildings*) at this time until the parapet situation and structural concerns are taken of.

Council member Isobaker restated what he heard to make sure he had the situation correct. He understood that the sloped roof was removed, the condition of the roof was apparently observed to be poor because they were trying to do some patching with tar. Council member Isobaker presumed this was before the rain started. Mr. Grooms stated his employees felt pretty confident that they had achieved that, but Mr. Grooms thought there were too many other places where water must be getting in that was not visible, so water was able to penetrate. He does not know exactly where the water was getting in – probably multiple areas. R.G. Construction also tried to put on some tarps and plastic to cover things. That has not been 100% effective either. They are just trying to buy time until the roofs can go on.

Council member Isobaker restated that the tarp, the tar and the plastic went down in an attempt to seal the roof. The next step was identified as Hopkins to put the roofing material on, but they had concern because they did not think the roof was stable. Mr. Grooms stated that the parapets on both sides, but predominately the parapet on 119 and 121 East Marion Street is by far the worst, because the parapet is in very poor condition probably due to the fact of the fire that happened however many years ago. This has compromised that whole diaphragm and pulled it in – actually pulled in and pulled out of the pockets of the roof joists and as a result there are holes in various places of that parapet wall. It is not structurally sound at this time to put a roof on 119 East Marion Street with the parapet wall in its current condition.

Council member Isobaker restated that at some point in time a structural engineer came down and looked at the wall at the City's request. Mayor Morlan stated yes, and that expediency was the issue at that point. The structural engineer determined that the wall between 119 and 121 East Marion Street buildings was in fact sound. The parapet wall was in bad condition. Mayor Morlan stated the structural wall the structural engineer deemed safe. He did have a couple of recommendations on that wall, but other than that he said it was structurally sound. Council member Isobaker restated that out of the abundance of caution the Hopkins organization did not want to put roofing material up on the building because they did not think it was safe at the time, but they could not seal it. Mr. Grooms stated they are unable to install their roofs on 117 and 119 East Marion Street until the parapet wall has been addressed and is structurally sound as that is how they terminate. They bring the membrane up the side of the parapet as that is how they terminate and fasten it there. They cannot put down the roof or install it until that has occurred. Council member Clark asked if we were discussing the parapet walls on both side of 119 East Marion Street. That is correct.

Council member Isobaker asked when the original study was done for the work on that side of the square for the Façade project, was the integrity of that wall evaluated. Mr. Grooms stated that it was not that he is aware of as he did not believe there was access to it. Mr. Curtis asked if they were talking about 121 East Marion Street, and he did say there was a structural engineer's report done. There is a full report on that wall and that building particularly. With the debris in the basement one can only get so far to do a true and proper evaluation of 121 East Marion Street. There should be two structural engineer reports from two different engineers. There is one

from Jim Tometich which was done in the fall of 2021 and the one by VJ Engineers done recently. Council member Iosbaker asked if the wall was judged to be stable.

Mr. Curtis explained what the parapet is. The parapet is a section of the brick wall in a downtown building wall. It is the extension of the parameter wall that extends past the top of the roof. It is really not flat; it slopes to the back. On a traditional downtown roof, it could be anywhere from six inches to four or five feet. Our parapets come up about twenty-four to thirty inches above the top of the roof. The purpose of those parapets is mainly for fire protection, jumping from one roof to another. This gives some extension to help that. It also defines the parameter of the building on the roof. There are all kinds of equipment that are put on roofs, and it is good to define where the building is at relative to the roof. A parapet, the section that goes above the roof, is not a structural component in of itself supporting the building. So, when they talk about structural needs, the roofer needs to have the parapet structural enough to properly attach his roofing membrane to it, so it does not have any voids. The parapet that sticks up is what is currently damaged. What was happening with the original hip roof in places there was a wall built on top of that parapet. Council member Clark asked if it was one parapet wall that butted up to the next wall or if there was a void or one wall. Mr. Curtis explained the parapet walls are three layers of brick that makes up the wall and both buildings share that wall of bricks. When you use the word structural comparative to the word parapet and the roofing contractor needs a structural for his roof membrane. The roofer does care about the overall structure of the roof as he wants his employees safe, but his main goal is that the parapet is solid enough to attach the membrane properly to the building itself and provide a warranty. Structure for 117 and 119 East Marion Street buildings: both buildings are side by side and roof that comes in on both buildings that engage the same parapet wall. They both have a second floor, and both hit one another at about the same elevation height wise (give an inch or two) as they hit the same three layers of brick wall. This would be the same for the main floors and then down into the basement. Moving over to 115 East Marion Street you have same situation. So, the nature of those buildings stacked side by side by side is like bookends that support one another's wall. This provides horizontal support to a vertical wall. These walls are not going anywhere. 121 East Marion Street does not have a roof, a second floor, or a main floor. It is not providing any horizontal structure to that wall (*the "party" wall between 119 and 121 East Marion Street*). The wall that does not have any push back that used to have push back when a building was there. Mr. Curtis stated that when you are talking about structural worries to him as an architect, the parapet is kind of irrelevant as there is no structural integrity to it for a traditional downtown building. He is worried about the wall that does not have the horizontal support up against it – 121 East Marion Street. Mr. Curtis stated that the word structure comes to him as he is worried about the integrity of the building itself. Because the parapet on the 117 and 119 East Marion Street buildings can be rebuilt or torn down, it is not needed. In reality we would like to have the fire protection, put the parapet back at thirty inches tall, but there is no function to it. However, the hip roof that was sitting on top of those two buildings, had a wall section that part was built on top of the parapet wall and then the tress systems was put on top of that wall. There was not only a thirty-inch parapet that was weak because the joints were bad, you had a little wall section that was tied to the top of that weak parapet and then tied to the roof truss. Mr. Curtis thinks it is a good thing that roof is off those buildings as the parapet wall was never meant to be structural for the integrity of the building. What happened when they put the hip roof on, they created those parapet walls to be structural components when they were never intended to be. In Mr. Curtis' opinion, as an architect, that roof coming off was huge and a big deal especially the condition in which the parapet was found. The reason structure is used in two different ways. Structure for the integrity of the parapet so the roofer can attach his warranty roof to and the structure of the building itself. This is two different things using the same word. The parapet is really not structural for the integrity of the building standing. The structural engineer was important to get involved in this thing. Mr. Curtis stated he would not have had a structural engineer involved between 117 and 119 East Marion Street buildings. They would have just fixed the parapet wall, so it was structurally sound for the roof. Because there is no need for that parapet the wall between the two buildings is structurally sound. It is not going anywhere because it has floor systems tied and roof systems tied into the one wall. A structural engineer was never needed for that system. Because there is no roof, second floor, or main floor, in the 121 East Marion Street building, the structural engineer was imperative that was brought in then to make sure that we were not only safe enough to be on the roof, but then the parapet could be rebuilt on top of that wall. Mr. Curtis stated a report has been provided and wondered if it has been read. Mr. Curtis' stated his understanding from that report is that it is okay to build the parapet on top of that wall. To Mr. Curtis that is important so that they can now move forward and get the parapet wall on that roof as fast as possible so that the roof can be put on as fast as possible. Council member Iosbaker restated that the concern about going up on the roof because of the concern about the wall between 119 and 121 East Marion Street delayed the application of the new roofing material. Mr. Curtis stated, that in his world, when you talk structure and that they are worried about being on the roof and I am hearing over all worries about the building itself. That is the clue to Mr. Curtis that a structural engineer needs to be brought in. Council member Iosbaker stated he did not think anyone would contest that as the safety of the workers would be paramount at that point in time. Mr. Curtis stated that is what has occurred and that is what has been the delay at the moment to secure that knowledge. Council member Clark stated that basically the next step is to rebuild the 119 East Marion Street

parapet wall on the roof so a roof can be put on. Mr. Curtis stated he thought Council member Clark was referring to the east side of the 119 East Marion Street. Mr. Curtis stated that 119 East Marion Street has two parapet walls with the one on the west side being cosmetic in order to strength the roof between 117 East Marion Street and 119 East Marion Street. But the parapet needs to be replaced between 119 and 121 East Marion Street, because it is in that bad of shape. Mr. Curtis stated the other thing is Rod Grooms has a mason that is going to be working off that roof there at the edge. That is another reason to have a structural engineer. Mr. Curtis believes the mason can work off of 119 East Marion Street side and build the parapet wall in its entirety by reaching over. Mr. Curtis stated that Mr. Grooms and the mason may disagree, but in his opinion that the mason does not really need to be on or lifted up on the 121 East Marion Street side in order to get the parapet built back in order to get the roof warrantee. Mr. Grooms stated that when they were first on the roof because he thought at least the intent on the roof was to build back the parapet the way it originally put together with brick. To do three widths of brick is going to be much more difficult for that far course. The farthest to the east course to 121 East Marion Street to get that in there good with mortar, but being they are able to go back with a twelve-inch block by eight inch high, in speaking with the mason he knows he can do this from 119 East Marion Street side safely. Mr. Curtis restated that if the parapet wall is rebuilt out of brick it is more difficult for the mason. Three bricks side by side is twelve inches. If they use eight-inch concrete block and four-inch concrete block that is twelve inches. They are talking about eight inches wide, eight inches tall and sixteen inches long. Mr. Grooms stated this may be irrelevant, but the thought process to provide a quality parapet I think in less time and a little more efficient, he can go ahead and use a twelve-inch block. Mr. Curtis stated the reason he is okay with block is that he believes that it is going to be covered on both sides. If this were going to be exposed to the visual of the square, they probably would not use block.

Council member Iosbaker restated roofing could not proceed because we had concerns about the wall between 119 and 121 East Marion Street. The work had to stop for the safety of the workers, etc. We had a roof that was open, the actual point of fact is it rained, and it caused considerable destruction inside the building. There was nothing to be done that could prevent that. Mr. Grooms stated that he knows the guys put in a lot of effort and hours, long hours and long days, to make sure they did their very best to prevent water infiltration. Obviously, they failed and that is why he has liability in this situation, because they were not able to do that and that is where we are at right now. Council member Clark stated it is his understanding that the roof was torn off and the next day it began to rain. Mr. Grooms responded he thinks that sounds correct. Council member Clark stated that he did not think there were a lot of days and man hours put into securing the roof. Mr. Grooms responded that there was time put into prepping the membrane to prevent the water infiltration. Mayor Morlan stated he thinks the roof removal must have taken about three days because on the last day they were up there it started raining. Mr. Grooms stated they might have still been removing something, but they had the vast majority of it already removed and they were trying to prevent more leaking. Mr. Grooms can identify, and he has the indication from Tim on his daily report that he knows he (*Tim*) spent a full day trying to prevent rain. That entire roof was probably not removed especially the very part to the south, the attachment, but he thinks they had the vast majority of the bigger portion or larger portion of the roof removed and tried to prevent the rain from coming in. Mr. Grooms stated that try as they may, they were not successful, and we all know that. Council member Clark stated that what is done is done and where do we move forward.

Council member Iosbaker stated that when he came into this Council session, the second question on his mind was whether or not we had communication issues within the project about how to respond, how to react to the situation as it was unfolding that might have delayed our actions or contributed to the problem that we have now. What he is hearing being said is that what has been described is a circumstance where there was coordination in calling the structural engineer. The City called the structural engineer. Mr. Curtis stated we tried to get Jim Tometich as he did the work on the 121 East Marion Street building. Mr. Curtis stated he had called Mr. Tometich because his recommendation was to use the same engineer and he thinks that would have been the best situation. Mr. Tometich was on vacation, and he said he will be back Monday, and he would let us know. Mr. Curtis told Mr. Tometich that he was calling in a favor and needed him here right away. Mr. Tometich told Mr. Curtis to remind him with an email at the top of his list so he could check his schedule. Monday came and Mr. Tometich stated that he could meet with us on the 18<sup>th</sup> which was a week and a half out. So, at that point Mr. Curtis stated that he would cold call and see what he could come up with or Mayor Morlan or City Clerk Alderson, if they knew someone could attack it. City Clerk Alderson stated she would find someone and did. This was the second structural engineer. He came from Iowa City and showed up the same day. Mayor Morlan stated that he is not saying much in all of this because he was very aware of everything happening – put it that way. He is letting Mr. Curtis describe the steps and Mr. Curtis told Mayor Morlan to correct him if necessary. Council member Clark asked how they were going to build the parapet wall on the east side of 119 East Marion Street and if there was a wall on the 121 East Marion Street side. Amanda Snakenberg stated it is the same wall as those buildings were built one after another after another. Mr. Curtis showed the Council a sketch he had. The sketch showed the parapet (a twelve-inch wall) that is going to be torn down and built back with twelve-inch block. They can do all that from one side

by reaching over all from the roof of the 119 East Marion Street building. Every two buildings share a common wall, and each building owns half of the wall and are responsible to help support their neighbor's wall with zero lot line setbacks which is what downtown is. Zero lot line setbacks mean you can build right up to the lot lines. The middle of the wall is built right on the lot line, and it is shared to maximize the space in the building. Mayor Morlan stated then you can actually use thinner walls because you are bracing the wall from both sides by your first floor, second floor and roof. Mr. Curtis stated that was correct and calls that a horizontal diaphragm. If we take the 121 East Marion Street building that does not have a roof and floor in it so the load as long as it is vertical, you are good. Masonry concrete block is very good in what we call compression. You can stand on it. You can put two feet of bricks on the floor and as long as you stand directly on top of it you can balance it and it will support the weight. He would be too heavy for a soda can and the moment you hit the sides of the soda can you go down. That is where the horizontal load does support the wall. If there is a failure the wall is going to bow. Then the floor joists are pocketed into the three layers of brick, so it is only into the first layer of brick and when it bows more than three inches or thereabouts that floor joist is going to fall. It is designed to do that actually for the safety of building and all that. That is the makeup, and it will pull right out. If you look at the wall on the 121 East Marion Street building you can see the pockets, holes in the wall from the floor joist that were there. It is that way on every building downtown. Council member Iosbaker asked if this implied that the façade project should not have been undertaken and is it unstable. Mr. Curtis stated that he does not think it is unstable especially with the roof off (of 117 and 119 East Marion Street buildings). The old hip roof was a problem waiting to happen from his perspective and he is glad it is off. Mr. Curtis stated that the roof on the two buildings, had there been a strong wind from the east and pushed on that parapet wall, which is delicate horizontally, bad things were going to happen to that roof. He is very glad that the hip roof is off the building. Mr. Grooms stated he agreed with Mr. Curtis. He stated there is a substantial amount of weight as some of those rafters were over forty feet long and there is significant weight when you put all those ??? and rafters and that wood that is up there together and then you add sheathing and shingle load, that is pretty substantial. Mr. Curtis stated that if he is asked if the wall that 119 East Marion Street shares with 121 East Marion Street stable, read your engineering reports, that would be his recommendation. Council member Clark asked what those say, and Mr. Curtis stated that he would get a copy of the engineer's report and let the engineer explain. He cannot get to the wall (neither engineer) so there are no assurances on that wall. Mr. Curtis further explained that it is vertical, and it is not going to go anywhere. There are no assurances. Council member Clark asked that essentially, they would look on both the east and west side of that wall to see if it is structurally sound. Mr. Curtis responded that it is going to push into the hole. It is not going to push into the floor system on 119 East Marion Street. Council member Clark asked if he owned a building in the downtown area and decided he was going to tear his building down and just have an open area, he could not do that because you are not making it safe for your neighbor. Mr. Curtis stated he would never do that because that is exactly what you are doing, jeopardizing the building next to you. Ms. Snakenberg added unless you structurally reconstruct / stabilize, and Mr. Curtis agreed. Mr. Groom stated that you would have to stabilize that wall. Council member Iosbaker stated he was looking at the report, but returning to his earlier question, no one said that the project should not have been undertaken because and Mr. Curtis said no. Council member Iosbaker also stated that there is no reason for that to be the case and Mr. Curtis stated that was correct. Mr. Curtis stated that they have good news and that even though the structural engineer could not get to the full wall to give us the guarantees we would really like to have, he gave us enough guarantees to go ahead and build back the parapet wall upon that wall and move forward with the roof. It was a good news report. Mayor Morlan stated he was with the structural engineer when they opened up the front door of 121 East Marion Street. They could see the wall and the engineer did a hammer test as there is actually a little platform when you get inside up against the wall that is still remaining and you can look in a hole in the backside and the engineer was feeling confident that everything was fine because the wall did not have a bow in it. It was very straight, and mortar was intact. In fact, a lot of that wall actually had a concrete facing on it, probably one-half to three-fourths inch. There were no cracks. Mr. Curtis stated that is an interior plaster and over time the rain will wash that. Mayor Morlan stated that if the wall were bowing it would have shown up. Mr. Curtis stated that Mr. Tometich carries a six- or eight-foot level with him and that is the only way he can tell if a wall is bowing is to put the level upon against the wall. The engineer would have an eye for this, but he only had one perspective from it.

Council member Iosbaker stated that his second question going into this was did we have an issue with coordinating activities between the roofing company, the structural engineer, the City and whoever else. Mr. Curtis stated he does not think so. There was a delay as we were trying to get Jim Tometich here and that was the delay. Council member Iosbaker stated there was a delay, the weather and we could not seal it, but it did not have anything to do with coordination. Mr. Curtis said not in his opinion. Mr. Grooms stated not that he was aware of.

Council member Iosbaker stated the third question he had coming in here was what additional steps need to be taken, if any, to ensure that we do not have another untoward event similar in nature. Is there anything else in this project that one could see reasonably that we need to be alert for. Mr. Grooms stated once the parapets are

strengthened and structurally sound and he knows this word has been used for multiple descriptions, but once the parapet wall is rebuilt over there on east side of 119 East Marion Street building and strengthened between 117 and 119 East Marion Street buildings and 115 and 117 East Marion Street buildings. Once those three parapets have been addressed and strengthened so they provide a fairly (consistent) ???, something to attach to for the roofing company. Once the roofs are installed, he does not foresee any other issues. Council member Iosbaker asked Mr. Grooms if he was referring specifically to 117 and 119 East Marion Street buildings or is he referring to projecting throughout the remaining buildings. Mr. Grooms responded that 109 has already taken place, so he is talking about 115, 117 and 119 East Marion Street roofs, respectively those three.

Council member Iosbaker asked that he had heard a comment that suggested there might be a concern with the warrantee on the roof between 105 and 109 East Marion Street buildings and has that been resolved. Mr. Curtis stated that yes. He had made contact with Mr. Grooms in reference to that and they received a written confirmation back from the roofer and Mr. Grooms relative to know the current roofer will and can provide the location proper for him to provide warrantee on his side and 105 East Marion Street will be able to provide a warrantee on his side. So, there is confirmation in email that the Mayor has. This is standard practice. Mr. Grooms stated that if the 105 East Marion Street building roof is going to happen later, they just cannot be up on 109 East Marion Street building's roof. According to Hopkins that will void the warrantee, but as long as they feed their material from a different direction, and they are not up on 109 East Marion Street building they are fine with working. Council member Iosbaker asked if there was any coordination, communication that needs to be done when they do the 105 East Marion Street building roof and how is that going to be handled. Mr. Grooms stated they are not doing the 105 East Marion Street roof. R.G. Construction is doing 109, 115, 117 and 119 East Marion Street building roofs. Council member Iosbaker asked if we needed to do anything to insure that 105 East Marion Street adheres to this practice or has this already been done. Mayor Morlan answered that has already pretty much been done. There is an understanding of what has to take place there. He (105 East Marion Street) has more or less an emergency, a roof leak that needs to be taken care of. He is not doing his whole roof. Council member Iosbaker restated (105 East Marion Street) is not doing the whole roof and he is not going to come over on 109 East Marion Street building. Mayor Morlan stated he is aware of the situation. Mr. Grooms stated there will be a termination point where Hopkins terminates their roof on the party wall between 105 and 109 East Marion Street and so their suggestion / recommendation is that when 105 East Marion Street does their roof when they come to the parapet they just terminate at the same point and not overlap 109 East Marion Street termination. They do not want 105 East Marion Street roof over the top of the 109 East Marion Street roof at any location.

Mr. Curtis asked Mr. Grooms if he would put together a schedule for 117 and 119 East Marion Street buildings that would lay out the next four to five weeks for those two particular buildings. And because there is damage inside the 119 East Marion Street building, he has no idea what the situation for the 117 East Marion Street building so he cannot speak upon 117 East Marion Street. He would like a process for moving forward on 119 East Marion Street relative to the insurance, the clean up that part of the project. Mr. Grooms stated that his knee jerk reaction is that it is up to the subcontractors (mason and roofer). He can definitely write out a schedule tomorrow for the next two to four weeks and email that to everybody. But verbally he can pass on tonight what he was told today when he had conversations with them. If they get approval on the change order requests to do the three parapets in question that work could start Monday. So next week he can go through all three parapets if he has the whole week. So next week Monday is the 16<sup>th</sup> which would take us through the 20<sup>th</sup> on Friday and then on the following week on the 25<sup>th</sup> or 26<sup>th</sup> Hopkins would come in and put on the three remaining roofs, which is 115, 117 and 119 East Marion Street building roofs. They would stay on site until they are completed. Mr. Grooms asked about getting rid of the street barricades. He would like to see that done and had instructed Tim to reach out to the Mayor today to see if that would be acceptable. They can fence around the areas they are working on so they do not the whole street for what the mason will be doing next week. They will not really need to barricade the street until Hopkins returns and if they are not returning until the 25<sup>th</sup> or 26<sup>th</sup> then barricades could be put back up that morning, whatever is acceptable to the City. Mr. Grooms hates to see them sit there if they are not necessary and he knows that is an inconvenience for the public. Mr. Grooms stated they would be willing to do that work for the City as they want to be accommodating. R.G. Construction stated they have been using the City's barricades and cones and they will incur the cost to take them down, take them to a storage facility and then take them back out in two weeks, just because they are trying to be accommodating and help out with the situation. Council member Iosbaker thanked Mr. Grooms for that.

One other question Council member Iosbaker asked is that the 25<sup>th</sup> / 26<sup>th</sup> is two weeks from now what is the condition of the 119 East Marion Street roof now. Is it tight or not. Mr. Grooms asked if we were talking about the roof itself not the parapet wall. Council member Iosbaker restated that he is asking if there is another spring rain what is going to happen to 119 East Marion Street. Mr. Grooms stated he wishes he could answer that, he knows they have spent a tremendous amount of time even after the rain and Hopkins helped out as well to seal it to the best of everybody's ability and that is what he can tell us. Mr. Curtis stated that while he was there before the

meeting there is some flapping over the side of the building towards the back. Mr. Grooms stated that if there is anything that has come loose or pulled loose because of the wind which is what it sounds like he can ask Tim to address this in the morning. Mayor Morlan knows there are at least two layers of the visqueen on that roof. Council member Iosbaker stated he thinks this is the sole remaining concern here in the remaining two weeks (it is great that we can get the parapet work done as quickly as was stated), but that leaves the roof at risk for the next two weeks and he thinks it is important that if it is at all possible the situation not be made any worse. There is a chance for rain most days in Sigourney. Mr. Grooms stated the weather seems to be changing off and on. They try to prepare for this every day. They look at the radar the night before, again at 7:00 a.m. and they make a decision about whether they can open the roof up. There has been a lot of hit or miss the last few weeks because of the rain. Fortunately, this week has been hot and dry. They will need to get the mason in which will mean pulling back the plastic visqueen to get to where the mason can get up there and get the parapet exposed the best he can, get it all demoed and removed and rebuild in twelve-inch block. That is not a slam bam thing. It does take a little bit of time and coordination, so they are going to just have to hit and miss the best way they can and just try to identify the weather every day. The imperative thing is that the mason may not be one hundred percent done by Friday if we do get rain, but there are a couple of days the following week that he could finish up. Mr. Grooms feels like in that time frame the mason can get done. Council member Iosbaker thinks he is doing his best to get things done as expeditiously as possible. The explicit ask is that we do whatever is possible to ensure there is no further damage to 117 and 119 East Marion Street buildings. Mr. Grooms stated that he understands.

Mayor Morlan stated he had a question regarding the 119 East Marion Street building. He was talking to the guys up there and tearing the ceilings down and the floors up to repair the water damage up there and there is a double ceiling up there. They took down the bottom ceiling and they said they are waiting for permission to take the upper ceiling off. There are about sixteen to eighteen inches difference between the two. He does not know how you would dry this out underneath the roof unless the second ceiling is taken down. Were they given permission to do that? Mr. Grooms stated that he does not direct ServPro. Ms. Snakenberg stated that is through the insurance adjustors for Auto Owners and the adjustor called her late this afternoon and he had talked to the head of ServPro on this project and he got approval for everything ServPro needed today. He got approval for everything from R.G. Construction's insurance adjustor. Mayor Morlan asked if they got permission to tear the second ceiling out and Ms. Snakenberg responded yes. There is a lot of mold and they are trying to minimize that, but that has nothing to do with Mr. Groom's company. This is his insurance company.

Mayor Morlan asked if there were any more questions. Council member McLaughlin stated she appreciated all the information. Council member Clark asked if there were any other concerns. Mr. Curtis assumed that Emily Wohler was present here relative to her roof. As she had to leave, Mr. Curtis will contact her to explain the roofing situation. Mayor Morlan thanked everyone for attending.

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 7:08 p.m.

---

Jimmy Morlan, Mayor

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Angela K. Alderson, City Clerk