

The special council meeting of the City of Browns Valley, MN was held at City Hall. Council members present were Mayor Harold Hansen, Members Mike Heck, Neil Madison, Tony Miller, and Ken Warren. Also in attendance were David Dombrowski Noble Roofing and Tom Schmitz. The meeting was called to order at 7:09 a. m. by Mayor Hansen.

The purpose of this special meeting is to discuss options regarding the repair and/or separation of the City Shop and the laundromat roof.

Schmitz stated that at a previous council meeting the Council had several questions for Dombrowski. Due to Dombrowski's busy calendar decided to arrange a special meeting when he was in the area.

Schmitz asked if there was a way to separate the two roofs should the Council decide to tear the building down if they build a new shop. Dombrowski said, "There is no right way to separate those roofs. A vertical parapet wall could be built in the valley between the two buildings, but would cause a problem for Tina down the road. That would be a way to completely separate it and have metal between the two buildings. What you're talking about is bringing Tina's roof up onto your building and then terminating it and knocking down your building later on. If you guys are going to be knocking down the building, the roof system that we'd be putting on isn't the right roof system for Tina when there's no building next to her. The she would have a single ply membrane roof on half of her roof exposed to the street and it just wouldn't look good, because as those things age, they turn dirty and you see stains on it. No one would ever be able to walk on that side of the roof, as if there was any bit of morning moisture, they would be sliding around. So, the best thing for her roof would be an asphalt shingle or metal roof after this building's removed. But, if somebody wanted to run her roof down onto the City's roof and cut into your roof and put that membrane underneath there somewhere your guy's roof wouldn't be secure because age of the existing roof systems. If you put a new roof system underneath it, that tie in point isn't going to be good. You'd have to go high enough up so that the snow wouldn't be able to sit up there, but your roof system wouldn't be secure either. That is something that I wouldn't do. My company wouldn't be doing that if you decide to go that option, because I don't believe that is the right way to do it.

Schmitz said, "That an idea was to go the length of the laundromat, from the top of our roof and foam down to the middle of the valley. Put some type of a trough of gutter system incorporated into the foam or build a parapet wall and separate it. Tina's roof wouldn't be able to be finished off. How would you do that if you're shingling and she has half a valley there?" Dombrowski said, "He wouldn't shingle it as with the two buildings are together, she can't have shingles. She just can't do it, that's why we'd put a single ply membrane. Of the two times that I've been on that city roof, I've seen it deteriorate. Where there's problems down here, if you go up about four to six feet there's another seam that's separated. The water's getting in there as well. I think that side is well past its service life.

The North half of the shop is leaking along the area of the valley between the two buildings. Should the Council decide to not demolish the building and use it for storage, the North one quarter of the shop, valley and Erickson's building could be overlaid with Dombrowski's product."

Dombrowski prior proposal was to remove the top layer of the asphalt area of the shop and apply his product over the existing steel roof. The City has never been given a labor estimate from Dombrowski.

Dombrowski provided another idea providing that both parties agreed upon it. He explained that a wall could be built in the valley the length of the laundromat that would provide a separation between the two buildings. The wall would be wrapped in steel and flashed onto each roof. This idea still doesn't make a

good repair should the shop building be removed.

The cost of building a new shop and how it's going to be paid for is causing some concern with some council members. The cost of removing the old shop and / or repairing the roof would be near the same costs. The existing shop could remain where it stands and used for storage, but there are other issues with the building that will need to be addressed should it not be removed.

Schmitz asked if the City was to apply Dombrowski's product over the North East 85 feet of the shop and then in one to two years decided to remove the building, would the product on the roof be able to be used to finish off Erickson's roof. Dombrowski affirmed that the product, if it's not too long after it was installed could be able to be finished off, but he didn't feel that Erickson would be happy with this product able to be seen from the street. Dombrowski's recommendation was to apply his product on the East of the shop roof down through the valley and up the West side of the laundromat. Then when or if the City removes the shop, to replace this product on the laundromat with asphalt shingles.

Hansen asked if there was a way to use rubber on one side and shingles on the other side of the valley and have the water run into a trough. Dombrowski explained that there is a low slope in the valley and it doesn't drain. Hansen asked about using Styrofoam to increase the slope in the valley. Dombrowski replied that he meant snow in the valley doesn't drain well, when the sun melts the snow causing the water to backup under the shingles creating an ice dam. His product will create a seamless roof eliminating a chance for to eventually leak through nail holes. A question was asked about running a product like rubber or TPO halfway up onto the roof of the laundromat and once the shop is removed to shingle back down toward the overhang. Dombrowski replied that the roof on the laundromat is 14 feet X 82 feet, so the cost of shingling should the shop be removed will be approximately \$2,000.00, so to replace the roofing on the laundromat will be minimal.

Dombrowski calculated the amount of shop roof that should be replaced would be 90 feet by the height of the shop roof. He stated that he could get the Council a price on this that morning. He stated that he wouldn't be able to start on the roof until the parapet wall has been stabilized as he would need to tie into the parapet wall with the membrane.

Dombrowski explained what happens when a roof starts to leak. The water runs infiltrates the roof in between the shingles, or roofing product. In the winter, the water freezes causing the hole to expand causing a small leak to become larger.

Miller asked about opening the shop roof up along the length of the laundromat so that the rafter tails on the shop can be accessed to find out how rotted they are. He stated that if repairs are made that new material shouldn't be covering up lumber that should be replaced.

Dombrowski was asked if he would place his product to four to six feet high onto the shop roof and the put his product onto the lower area of the roof, through the valley and onto the roof of the laundromat and then flash the area of the shop roof over his product. He stated that he does not feel that this fix would be a good practice to do.

The conversation returned to the amount of rot is on the tail rafters. It was said that knowing this would help in making a decision and that the building inspector should be called to investigate the area around the tail rafters.

Dombrowski said, "My perspective on this, you can tell me to shut up because I'm not on the Board, but I see an eventual cost for the City. It's either take it down or put a roof on it. And that cost to what I'm saying is that it seems the cost is about the same, probably a little bit more to take the roof down or take the whole building down, but the longer you wait labor's going up, material's going up. There's going to be an eventual cost and it will rise with inflation. Really a decision needs to be made, is it coming down or is it

staying up and if it's staying up you might as well put the money in to make sure the building will stay up. This, not sure stuff, this is sunken money, let's say that it's going to cost you \$15,000.00 to \$16,000.00 to do your portion of the roof, your still going to have an issue on this backside or down over here on this side. Down the road you may have to replace more of that roof if you're going to keep the building up. Let say you get more leaks on those roofs that it's going to be more costs. I would think that there would be some kind of finance options where a city can service a loan over a long period of time."

A few Council members stated that we already have the sewer project. Dombrowski asked if there were grants through the State of Minnesota. Schmitz replied that there are programs with low interest loans.

Warren asked, "What's the investment to fix the whole roof, \$40,000.00?" Dombrowski replied, "I would urge you guys to go a little bit more than that. Is that to include flashing up the wall? I would think flashing up the wall and cap metal would be worth the investment if you're going to keep the building.

Heck stated that the City has rough cost of \$50,000 to resurface the whole roof and \$20,000 to replace the front wall. Dombrowski stated that should the City keep the existing front wall, it would need to be tuck pointed as well as tied into the roof. He stated that tuck pointing the front of the shop would be around \$20,000.00 and that's not securing it in to the roof. He stated that it would be a maintenance expense in future years.

Dombrowski stated that, if the City knows that it is going to be removing the shop in the future, the roof could be cut open the length of the laundromat allowing Erickson's roof to be repaired. He also stated that he wouldn't be doing the work and doesn't believe that it should be done that way. He said, "I wouldn't, but I think that it can be. I don't think you guys should open up a hole along the side of the building. It's a fair idea, it's just that you have to know that you are tearing the building down at that point."

Schmitz asked, "So the best fix is to put your product down and up and if we decide to tear the building down."

Dombrowski explained how his product is heat welded together and that there is no way for water to infiltrate the seam, whereas, a rubber roof is glued together. The glue can fail over time and then there is the issue with water infiltration.

Prior to the end of the meeting, the Council asked Dombrowski for three options. One is to provide a price for the North East 90 feet of the shop roof to the peak, second a price for the East side of the shop roof to the peak and the last a price for the whole shop roof.

Serocki asked if overlapping TPO along the wall with spray foam would work. Dombrowski replied that if the spray foam adheres to the TPO there should be no problem, but to make sure to find out from the contractor.

With a motion by Heck, the meeting was adjourned at 08:00 a. m.

Minutes submitted by:

Approved by:

Thomas A Schmitz, Clerk

Mike Heck, Acting Mayor