

A recessed meeting of the City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, was held in the Council Chamber in the City Hall, on Wednesday, October 18, 1967 at 3:00 o'clock p.m., with Mayor Stan R. Brookshire presiding, and Councilmen Fred D. Alexander, Sandy R. Jordan, Milton Short, James B. Stegall, Jerry Tuttle and James B. Whittington present.

ABSENT: Councilman Gibson-L. Smith.

* * * * *

PURPOSE OF MEETING.

Mayor Brookshire stated last Monday, October 16, Council recessed the session of Council to meet again at this date and hour to give consideration to bids for the Law Enforcement Center. He stated there were a few things that had to be brought to a conclusion before Council felt it had a green light to make these awards. In connection with the negotiations which did resolve the matter, he stated Council appreciated all of those who participated in the negotiations which were rather lengthy and drawnout. The negotiations were conducted on a friendly basis; there were no remarks or words that should leave any wounds whatsoever. That the matter has been brought to a satisfactory and friendly conclusion.

CONTRACT AWARDED JUNO CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT CENTER AND PLAZA.

Councilman Jordan moved award of contract to the low bidder, Juno Construction Corporation, in the amount of \$1,595,550.00, on a unit price basis for the general construction of the Law Enforcement Center and Plaza. The motion was seconded by Councilman Tuttle, and carried unanimously.

The following bids were received:

Juno Construction Corporation	\$ 1,595,550.00
J. L. Coe Construction Co., Inc.	1,640,000.00
Dickerson, Inc.	1,641,100.00
C. P. Street Const. Co.	1,660,700.00
F. N. Thompson, Inc.	1,669,760.00
H. L. Coble Const. Co.	1,819,000.00

CONTRACT AWARDED EMBREE-REED, INC. FOR PLUMBING OF LAW ENFORCEMENT CENTER AND PLAZA.

Motion was made by Councilman Alexander awarding contract to the low bidder, Embree-Reed, Inc., in the amount of \$78,888.00 on a unit price basis, for plumbing contract for Law Enforcement Center and Plaza. The motion was seconded by Councilman Whittington, and carried unanimously.

The following bids were received:

Embree-Reed, Inc.	\$ 78,888.00
Daniels Plumbing Company	88,116.00
Shanklin Air Conditioning, Inc.	98,000.00
Hicks & Ingle Corporation	99,397.00
Tompkins-Johnston Co., Inc.	102,340.00
A. Z. Price & Associates, Inc.	136,880.00
Impac, Inc.	139,583.00
P. C. Godfrey, Inc.	145,665.00

CONTRACT AWARDED EMBREE-REED, INC. FOR MECHANICAL CONTRACT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT CENTER AND PLAZA.

Upon motion of Councilman Jordan, seconded by Councilman Whittington, and unanimously carried, contract was awarded the low bidder, Embree-Reed, Inc. in the amount of \$305,822.00 on a unit price basis for the mechanical contract for the Law Enforcement Center and Plaza.

The following bids were received:

Embree-Reed, Inc.	\$ 305,822.00
Impac, Inc.	306,300.00
Hicks & Ingle Corporation	307,490.00
Shanklin Air Conditioning, Inc.	307,800.00
Southern Comfort of Charlotte	309,000.00
Southern Piping & Engr. Co., Inc.	333,736.00

CONTRACT AWARDED THE INDUSTRIAL ELECTRIC COMPANY FOR ELECTRICAL CONTRACT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT CENTER AND PLAZA.

The City Manager advised the last bid for the Law Enforcement Center and Plaza is the electrical contract with The Industrial Electric Company being the low bidder, in the amount of \$416,500.00.

Councilman Whittington stated the communication systems now used in the city is 80 percent Motorola and about 20 percent General Electric. In the eight or nine years he has been on the Council, it has never varied from this equipment except one time and that was G.E. which went into some of the Police Cars. Since that time, we are back generally to Motorola. He stated he knows nothing about either company except by reputation, and he knows nothing about Technical Products except that it is a company in California who has an installation in the Durham Police Department but that is all he knows about it. That what should be considered is engineers to make repairs or make additions to, if anything happens to this equipment. This is about \$240,000 for the communications equipment; that all would agree this is the gut of any department where communications is involved that this be the very best. He stated he does not question that this is or is not; that he does question here is a company that far away with no representatives or technical people in this part of the country, in fact in this state. He stated he would question the fact whether these people have actually given to Mr. Walter Toy, the Architect, the specifications as written by the architect to base his recommendations upon.

Mayor Brookshire stated this is a matter that has already been discussed by Mr. Veeder, the architect and others. Before Council becomes involved, he requested Mr. Kiser, City Attorney, to tell Council to what extent they have any control over the subcontracts in the awards being made this afternoon, as long as the subcontractors meet the specifications the architect has laid down.

Mr. Kiser replied this afternoon Council has before it the question of the award of the electrical contract and the bidders are as listed, the low bidder being the Industrial Electric Company. In the specifications of the contract there are provisions relating to examination of the subcontractor to determine if they are acceptable. There are provisions relating to some of the things a subcontractor have to satisfy when it comes to determining whether they are acceptable.

He stated the provision on the award of subcontracts reads that after bids are received and prior to the award of contract, the successful bidder shall furnish to the architect, in writing for acceptance by the owner and the architect, the lists of the names of the subcontractors or other persons or organizations proposed for such portions of the work that may be designated in the bidding requirements. Subcontractors proposed for the principal portions of the work should be listed. Prior to the award of the contract, the architect shall notify the successful bidder in writing if either the owner or architect after due investigation has reasonable objection to any person or organization on the list.

Mr. Kiser stated information he has is that the Police Department, Chief Ingersoll, the Architect, and Mr. Helms, who has responsibility for the electronics equipment and communications matters, have investigated these people and feel they are satisfactory subcontractors and would approve the subcontracts being awarded Technical Products, Inc. The question now is whether the award should be made to Industrial Electric Company who is the low bidder.

Councilman Stegall asked if the prime contractor whose subcontract to the subcontractor is responsible through his bond or does the subcontractor have to furnish bond? Mr. Kiser replied the Industrial Electric Company in this case is bound by its bond to the City of Charlotte, and the subcontractor would be bound to Industrial Electric Company; the City is covered by the Industrial Electric Company's bond. Councilman Tuttle asked if there is any relation in this situation to that which we have often with one bid and the reason for it being that this is equipment that relates to present equipment and on this equipment would be justified because it fits in with, or is the only equipment that will adapt itself to other master equipment? Would the fact that we have taken single bids in instances such as this relate in anyway to the equipment of Technical Products as to whether or not their parts would intergrate into this system, as well as or to a lesser degree than? Mr. Clegg Helms replied this is control equipment that will be designed to meet any system, and will be used to control the RF equipment that the City will purchase at a later date regardless of what it might be.

Councilman Whittington asked what if a breakdown occurs in the system, who would repair this, where would they get the professional advice or help from the representatives of the Company - they being in Hollywood. Mr. Helms replied he has never been in that circumstance as his division usually performs this service and does not call on parent companies. Councilman Whittington stated suppose you did not have this sort of help, where would you get the advice? Mr. Helms replied the proper thing to do would be call the firm that installed the equipment originally, Technical Products in this case. Councilman Whittington asked if they have any equipment on the eastern part of the United States, and Mr. Helms replied there are two systems in the State of North Carolina - Durham and Greensboro. Mr. Helms stated the only place that any difficulty has been experienced is in Durham and in that case they had no communications for about an hour; that they have investigated this, and they have a contract with people in Durham to keep this; how fast the services are or the qualifications of the men he cannot state, but they have had some difficulties in Durham which was corrected rather quickly.

Councilman Stegall asked if there is a warranty on this equipment? Mr. Helms replied there is no maintenance contract involved in this communication package. Councilman Stegall stated then once it is installed and the city accepts it, it is ours? Mr. Helms replied that is correct. Councilman

Tuttle stated that is also correct as far as any other bid is concerned. Mr. Veeder, City Manager, stated the City of Charlotte has the capacity within Mr. Helms' organization to take care of this type of equipment ourselves and there is no hesitancy or reservations about Mr. Helms' organization, and it was for this reason there is no maintenance contract requested or called for in the specifications.

Councilman Jordan stated on the recommendation of the Architects, Chief Ingersoll and Mr. Clegg Helms, he moved that the low bid of Industrial Electric Company in the amount of \$416,500 on a unit price basis be accepted. The motion was seconded by Councilman Tuttle.

At the question of Councilman Short, Mr. Helms stated they will not look to Industrial Electric Company for anything, and will look to Technical Products to supply the necessary repairs as per the warranty on parts. Councilman Short asked if it was necessary could we make a contract with Industrial Electric for repairs? Mr. Helms replied you could.

Mayor Brookshire stated it should be pointed out that the City has a department, and not just one man, to look after the maintenance of the equipment.

Councilman Short stated as a backup and if we had to have such, is Industrial Electric Company available for contracting for maintenance? Mr. Helms replied he cannot say because without a maintenance clause in the contract, he did not investigate this.

Mr. John Blanton, of Motorola Corporation, stated he does not know of anywhere of a more capable man than Mr. Clegg Helms, and the City of Charlotte is extremely fortunate. He stated in connection with the investment - this is over \$2,000,000, the whole heart is the communications system. To compromise this system even in a small way would be a tremendous risk. He stated it is important that the supplier of this communications system be a total supplier, and the supplier be capable of designing and manufacturing all the electronic equipment associated with it; it is also important that the supplier have local capability and national capability. Motorola meets all these requirements without reservation - they even design and manufacture their equipment; they have the backup right here in the City of Charlotte. That it should be apparent that Motorola is in the best position to provide this service.

He stated there are eleven direct Motorola representatives; three of these are factory-trained engineer representatives with only one responsibility which is to correct problems wherever they occur.

Mr. Blanton stated it was apparent to them that the submittals required in the specifications were to be in at the time of the bids, September 6, 1967. This was essential and appropriate in order that they could be properly evaluated. He stated their submittals were made prior to that date, and there were no other submittals made at that time; they understand that a later date of September 22 the other bidder was given 10 days which was October 4. To the best of their knowledge these submittals were not made on October 4 so their position is that since these submittals were not made as specified, that any submittals after that date should be null and void. The final and key point that they wish to make is that the supplier of the communication console must meet the specifications. That Paragraph E8B of Section 8, covering the specifications of the communications

control center, reads as follows:

"Manufacturers shall include only equipment which is of current design and manufacture. Electronic equipment shall be manufacturer's own design and manufacture in order to fix system responsibility with the manufacturer and to assure system integrity. Certain highly specialized equipment is listed by manufacturer and/or model number and as such is exempt from this requirement. For these exempt items, manufacturer may propose equipment of a different manufacturer provided that he obtains, in writing, approval of the architect for the items he proposes to substitute, said approval shall be obtained prior to fabrication."

He stated Motorola meets this paragraph without exception; to their knowledge the other potential supplier is not a manufacturer and therefore does not meet this most vital paragraph and in not meeting it, they are not eligible to file this bid on the control center. In view of these facts, Motorola requests that the Council stipulate to the low bidder that the equipment be provided to meet specifications which is Motorola.

Mayor Brookshire asked Mr. Blanton if he bid Motorola equipment to Industrial Electric Company. Mr. Blanton replied yes, the specifications were published back on August 6; everybody was capable of picking these specifications up; and Motorola in turn prepared a letter giving the same price to all electrical contractors, stating Motorola would provide performance bonds, guaranteeing to meet specifications. That this went to each and every electrical contractor. Mayor Brookshire asked Mr. Blanton if any of the other electrical contractors bidding this project used Motorola's bid? Mr. Blanton replied yes, he knew for a fact that the next three bidders from the low bidder bid Motorola equipment and he believes he can speak for a fact on the next three.

Mayor Brookshire asked Mr. Kiser, City Attorney, if the award of this part of the Law Enforcement Center on the electrical were made to the Industrial Electric Company, is the City in any position to specify their subcontractor as long as what they offer meets the specifications? Mr. Kiser replied the provisions of the contract provides: if prior to the award, the owner or architect has reasonable objection to and refuses to accept any person or organization on the list, the successful bidder, (in this case the lower bidder would be Industrial Electric Company), may prior to the award withdraw his bid without forfeiture of bid security. If the successful bidder submits a successful substitute with an increase in his bid price to cover the difference in cost occasioned by the substitution, the owner may, at his discretion, accept the increase bid price or he may disqualify the bid. That if we had reasonable objection to and refuse to accept any person listed on this list we could do this now.

Mayor Brookshire asked if we know whether Industrial Electric Company is amenable to the request to furnish Motorola or if there would be an extra in there. Mr. Kiser stated he did not know the answer to that.

Mr. Walter Toy stated apparently there is some wording in their specifications the intent of which is not entirely clear; that listed as acceptable bidders, or subcontractors, under the communications control center is Motorola, Incorporated of Chicago and Technical Products Engineering Company of Hollywood, California. These listings were made after very careful investigations of both companies and the products which they produce. There are several paragraphs which request certain drawings and certain technical information and to him it is not clear that the information shall be submitted with the proposals. This would be the proposals of the subbidder to the prime bidder. Councilman Tuttle asked if Mr. Toy is satisfied that they were not aware that they were late with the bid? Mr. Toy stated yes, there is nothing that states clearly that the data must be submitted with the

proposals; that Mr. Kiser could comment on this; Mr. Kiser stated that is correct.

Mayor Brookshire asked if the Technical Products Company is a manufacturer? Mr. Toy stated as far as he knew, they are manufacturers; that there are certain parts that any manufacturer must purchase from other manufacturers but he feels he is not qualified to comment any further than to say that Technical Products is a manufacturer.

Councilman Alexander asked Mr. Toy if investigations should prove that they would not be classified as a manufacturer, would Industrial Electrical Company be a legal bid? Councilman Whittington asked if the specifications state that the bidder must manufacture their own parts and components for the console?

Mr. Toy stated the first page of the communications specifications list the acceptable manufacturers, There were two, which he understands are the only two capable of doing this type of work in the United States. It seemed if there had been any reasonable doubt in the mind of anybody as to anyone of them furnishing the product, the question should have been brought up at an earlier date.

Mr. Kiser stated since there is nothing in this part of the specifications under the console relating to the time by which this information should be submitted and since this is a subcontractor and not the contractor to whom we are making the award, he does not believe that it is significant at what point the information is submitted. Furthermore, in another section of the contract which he just read to Council, there is a provision that as soon as practicable after the bids are received and prior to the award, that the owner shall make the investigation to determine whether these people who are listed as subcontractors are satisfactory - the owner and the architect's so that added to the comments added before makes insignificant the time by which the information was submitted.

Councilman Short asked if it is significant whether or not Technical Products Company may be logically classified as a manufacturer? Mr. Kiser stated he felt Mr. Helms is prepared to talk regarding this.

Mr. Clegg Helms stated when he gets a set of specifications he must determine who is eligible. That in this instance, there are two bidders. His specifications say the electronic equipment and by electronic equipment it may mean anything from this microphone to this entire system. The only thing that he can say about the way he arrived at whether or not Technical Products Engineering is a manufacturer is this - Technical Products secures the electronic parts and components and assembles them into a basic unit or units which when completed will control the radio transmission system receivers or transmitters in accordance with these specifications, that is the basis on which he classifies Technical Products as manufacturers because they get various components and materials and build them into what we ask for. We have technical manuals showing exactly what they manufacture, what they do not manufacture, and their assembly process and that is the reason they were approved as one of the subcontractors; that both subcontractors are approved. That there are various items in this business that no one manufactures - they buy it from other people - this is one of the things that happens in any manufacturing business - you do not manufacture everything that you use in construction. He had no alternative other than to class Technical Products Engineering as a manufacturer, based on these facts.

Councilman Jordan asked if Industrial Electric Company had bid Motorola instead of the other company, do you know how much difference this would have been? Mr. Helms stated he did not know money-wise.

Councilman Stegall asked if all the information had been submitted that was required in this bidding? Mr. Helms replied submittals from both contractors were submitted and completed as of Monday morning and are now in his hands.

Mr. Veeder asked if they both met with his approval and Mr. Helms replied both meet his approval.

Councilman Tuttle stated that he is satisfied that these people would be manufacturers, when you think of Ford Motor Company and the fact that they buy their tires, clocks, seat springs, spark plugs, speedometers, fabrics, radios, air conditioning, springs, paint, bearings and wiring from somebody else, they certainly do not cease to be manufacturers.

Mr. Helms presented pictures of each manufacturer's concept of the consoles when completed. Mayor Brookshire stated it is what is in the cabinet that is important, rather than the appearance of it.

Mr. Helms presented the submittals that were required, their drawings, and their color samples; and stated as far as he was concerned, it gave him the proper information to evaluate the two to see whether or not we could approve them; that both of the manufacturers have furnished what was asked for so that he could determine the approved subcontractor.

Mayor Brookshire asked Mr. Helms if he had made a very careful study between the two proposals. Mr. Helms replied yes; they have made evaluations; have talked to a number of people throughout the country who use this equipment and when it comes to what they have found - they have found nothing that they can turn these people down on from a technical standpoint.

Councilman Stegall asked if there were any proposals from any other than these two companies? Mr. Helms replied these were the only two companies we had proposals from; that he had contacted several smaller companies but they were not interested at this time because of their workload and the size of this job.

Councilman Alexander asked how many other towns did Mr. Helms say that he knew of that handled these systems Technical Products in North Carolina. Mr. Helms stated in North Carolina there are two cities; that he asked that the subcontractors have at least five systems in different cities operating satisfactorily; both Motorola and Technical Products were to supply this information as to cities that they had equipment operating in and how long they had been there and the service that it had been giving.

Councilman Alexander asked how long have the two cities in North Carolina been using their equipment? Mr. Helms stated Greensboro has been using it since 1965 and Durham about one and one-half years and according to the reports, they have given favorable service.

Mr. Helms stated he had contacted Durham, Greensboro and Grand Rapids which are their closest and latest systems where he knows the radio engineers; and Chief Ingersoll contacted the Chiefs of Police in several towns; that he also contacted Orange County, California which is the home of Technical Products as they have a system there.

Councilman Whittington asked the ratio of Motorola systems against Technical Products? Mr. Helms replied he could not say because when we get into \$200,000 centers; you do not talk about too many of them over the country.

Councilman Alexander stated he is willing to abide by our technical staff's recommendation on this; he thinks Council could ask a million questions regarding this and get a different answer; as long as Chief Ingersoll and our technical experts are satisfied and have the necessary inquiries to justify their positions in approving this products of Technical Products, Inc., he feels he can abide by their decision.

Councilman Tuttle stated he leans very strongly toward a local company getting the business and in this case a difference of \$8,000 in a \$400,000 job is almost like peanuts. He is satisfied there has been no shenanigans insofar as lateness of the submittals and he is also satisfied that insofar as being a manufacturer, these people who are taking the various parts and putting them together in a unit is a manufacturer. That he does not think when you buy a Crosley Television or Motorola Television, you do anymore than get something that they have designed; they are using RCA, Westinghouse and everybody else's parts and wires and tubes so he is satisfied that they are manufacturers. He has looked for technicalities; that he would like to see this business go to a local bidder but he does not think from what he has heard here today that he can do anything but vote for the low bid.

Mr. Fred Stacey, Zone Manager for Motorola in Charlotte, stated Motorola, Inc. is an electronic manufacturer because they design all of their own components; they determine exactly what the component is going to be and then they subcontract with a supplier to furnish that component. Before it is accepted, a shipment is subjected to certain tests to make sure that it meets not a standard parts specification but Motorola's specifications. It is within tolerance and within weight; that it does what it is supposed to do or exceeds it and if a certain percentage of this shipment does not meet the specifications, then it is returned completely; but if it is accepted, then it is a Motorola part. That he might draw an analogy here that Council would probably be familiar with - Holman Moody makes automobiles, but they are fabricators; as Technical Products is a fabricator; they assemble a product from standard parts, as defined in the dictionary. A manufacturer must be a manufacturer complete from design and if it happens that he gets it from a sub-supplier, this does not make him any less a manufacturer, however, according to the dictionary, a fabricator is somebody who assembles; one who buys parts here and there and assembles them. That a reasonable interpretation of this paragraph which the City inserted for its protection because of the complexity of the control center they wanted to make sure that the person who furnished it was not a fabricator; that he was a manufacturer and had the facilities to design the different complex components. That for a determination of the word "manufacturer" of electronic equipment, you have to determine that this manufacturer in fact does design and does prescribe exactly the quality of the special parts that have to go into such a complex piece of equipment. All the trade journals and all information indicates that Technical Products Engineering does nothing except assemble and procure parts - they are not a manufacturer under any sense of the term.

Councilman Tuttle stated that Holman Moody does not manufacture anything, they assemble an automobile or motor; he asked if Industrial Electric knows that the subcontractor does not manufacture any of their equipment? The representative of Industrial Electric Company replied all of them do a certain amount of assembling. Councilman Whittington asked if they went to any other bidder other than Technical Products for the specifications

on the console communications? The representative replied they all had the same specifications; that they did receive a bid from Motorola.

Councilman Short stated we are requiring not only a manufacturer but a manufacturer with currently active stock numbers; that it seems to require a little more than just the basic designation of manufacturer.

Mr. Blanton stated the term manufacturer as used is defined as the subcontractor of the whole control system as required. That it is significant and is specified in the specifications. He stated the point they are making is that you get down to facts and legal aspects as it is written in the specifications.

Mr. Kiser stated based upon information given by Mr. Helms, reading the language in the context of the submission of equipment which is a whole control system, that in his opinion, Technical Products complies with the requirements set forth in the specifications.

Councilman Tuttle asked if there is a sufficient difference where Council can assume there is some apparent confusion in the wording of the specifications to the extent that it could legally reject all bids. Mr. Kiser replied the City reserves the right to reject any or all bids, and this is provided for in the advertisement. Councilman Whittington asked what takes place if Council rejects the product the low bidder says he will use? Mr. Kiser replied if the owner or architect, prior to the award of contract, has reasonable objection to and refuses to accept any person or organization listed on the subcontract lists, the successful bidder may withdraw his bid without forfeiture of bid security; the successful bidder may submit an acceptable substitute with an increase in the bid price to cover the difference in cost occasioned by the substitution; and if he does that, the owner may accept the increase bid or may disqualify the bid. If the award is made and then refused to accept any person or organization on the list, the contractor can submit an acceptable substitute and the contract sum should be increased or decreased by the difference in cost occasioned by the substitution by appropriate change order; that is what would happen if this problem had arisen after the award of the contract.

Mr. Kiser stated the only bid that we have an extension of time on for the electrical contract is Industrial Electric Company and we do not know whether these other bids are still extended.

Councilman Whittington stated he has no quarrels with either one of these people nor does he champion either one; that he feels what he said at the beginning stands at this time, and for that reason he is not going to vote for this particular bid.

Mr. Toy stated he is not sure of our position in this legally but inasmuch as both of these manufacturers have been studied, the job put out to bid, and listed the two as acceptable manufacturers who could bid, and the only two who could bid that we would not be leaving ourselves open to some adverse comment or legal action if we said that Technical Products is not capable inasmuch as they do meet the specification in its full intent.

Mr. Toy stated the only thing in the specifications that is not clear is there is no definite statement that says that the technical information

and drawing shall be submitted with the proposals. That he feels we are leaving ourselves open to legal action by saying that an approved manufacturer is not acceptable.

Councilman Short stated he is going to vote regrettably for this motion because he thinks it is important to have the other type of equipment in use all over our city system, but you cannot get around the fact that the Industrial Electric Company has bid a product which was specifically named as being satisfactory.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried by the following vote:

YEAS: Councilmen Jordan, Tuttle, Alexander and Short.
NAYS: Councilmen Whittington and Stegall.

The following bids were received:

The Industrial Electric Co.	\$ 416,500.00
Watson Electric Co., Inc.	424,380.00
Hensley & Mosley, Inc.	424,420.00
Howard Electric Co., Inc.	432,940.00
Reid Electric Co., Inc.	458,175.00
Meva Corporation	459,447.00
Todd Electric Co., Inc.	464,701.00
Austin Electric Co.	493,184.00
Shanklin Air Conditioning, Inc.	498,000.00

PROPOSAL OF LAW ENGINEERING TESTING COMPANY FOR SOIL AND CONCRETE TESTING SERVICES FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT CENTER, APPROVED.

Councilman Whittington moved approval of the proposal of Law Engineering Testing Company for soil and concrete testing services for the Law Enforcement Center, at an estimated cost of \$7,700. The motion was seconded by Councilman Jordan, and carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT.

Upon motion of Councilman Jordan, seconded by Councilman Alexander, and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned.

Ruth Armstrong
Ruth Armstrong, City Clerk