

File No. 10178.

CORRESPONDENCE.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY,- IMPROVEMENTS.  
CITY HALL,  
SUB-DEPARTMENT - OFFICE INSPECTOR OF BUILDINGS.

Baltimore, June 17, 1909.

Sylvan H. Lauchheimer, Esq.,  
Deputy City Solicitor.

Dear Sir:-

7834

Referring to the controversy about the steel cell construction at the Baltimore City Jail, I would make the following statement.

Provision having been made, in the Ordinance of Estimates for 1908, for additional cell room at the Baltimore City Jail, in compliance with Ordinance No. 18, approved October 15, 1907, (see copy enclosed) I advertised for competitive designs from architects by giving ten days' notice in the daily papers, commencing April 2, 1908, and the competitive designs were to be submitted by May 1, 1908. The plans received were handed over by me to the Architectural Commission, who decided favorably on those submitted by Mr. Theodore Welle Pietsch.

After notifying the architect, and he had given me the drawings and specifications, - which, on page 26, calls for certain modes of cell construction (such as the one in question) - I advertised, under authority from the Board of Awards, from July 1, 1908 for ten days, for proposals for construction of the work. Permit me here to call your attention to specifications under head of Generally, page 2 of specifications, also under head of Alterations, page 3 of specifications, also under head of Deviations, page 7 of specifications, and the whole specifications tending to show the Inspector of Buildings to approve of all work and materials.

The bids received for the above work were opened July 22, 1908, and, owing to a question being raised as to the most desirable method of cell construction, (steel or concrete) the bids were rejected, and the Board of Awards directed the Inspector of Buildings to re-advertise for the addition to have cells with sides and rear of reinforced concrete and the cell front of steel.