Public Document No. 107

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

FIRE PREVENTION COMMISSIONER

FOR THE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT,

MASSACHUSETTS.

FROM AUGUST 1, 1916, TO AUGUST 1, 1917.

BOSTON:
WRIGHT & POTTER PRINTING CO., STATE PRINTERS,
32 DERNE STREET.
1917.

Publication of this Document
approved by the
Supervisor of Administration.

CONTENTS.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

To His Excellency Samuel W. McCall, *Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.*

Sir: — The Fire Prevention Commissioner for the Metropolitan District herewith submits his third annual report.

Very respectfully,

JOHN A. O'KEEFE,
Fire Prevention Commissioner for the Metropolitan District.

Fire Prevention Commissioner for the Metropolitan District.

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT.

Results of Fire Prevention during 1916.

During the year 1916 the methods outlined in my previous report for checking and limiting fires were followed with increasing results. Inspections were regularly made in the city of Boston by the district chiefs, captains and lieutenants, and to a varying extent in the other cities and towns of the district. Reports of these inspections were forwarded to the office of the Fire Prevention Commissioner, and action was taken by him to correct the conditions disclosed in the reports. Inspection work is well performed in the city of Boston; in other cities and towns there is still much to be desired. The prevention of fire depends on the removal of the conditions that lead to fire, and the presence of those conditions can be learned only by inspection.

A great deal has been done towards limiting the disastrous effects of fires once started by the installation of automatic sprinkler systems throughout the district.

During the year 1916 the fire loss in Boston was reduced $530,100 from the loss of the preceding year; throughout the rest of the district the loss of 1916 was $363,800 less than the loss of 1915. This makes the total reduction in the district for the year 1916, $893,900.

Not only has the loss by fire been checked, but to a very large extent the number of alarms. In 1914 the number of alarms throughout the district was 13,477; in 1916 the number of alarms was 10,568. Every alarm that calls out the fire department, whether there is a fire or not, entails considerable

expense on the city with the danger of accidents and the wear and tear of apparatus. The other day in the town of Lexington the department was called out on a needless alarm, and while out a serious fire occurred that obtained a headway which it would not have obtained had the department been in its houses. Within a few weeks in the city of Boston a part of the department was called out on a false alarm and met with a serious accident. For these reasons it has been considered very important to decrease as far as possible the number of runs.

The following table shows the loss and the per capita loss for the Metropolitan District as it is to-day made up during the years 1914, 1915 and 1916: —

Losses and Per Capita Losses in the Metropolitan District for 1914, 1915 and 1916.

	Loss for 1914.	Per Capita Loss for 1914.	Loss for 1915.	Per Capita Loss for 1915.	Loss for 1916.	Per Capita Loss for 1916.
Arlington,	$32,200	$2 27	$11,400	$0 77	$12,600	$0 81
Belmont,	26,000	3 42	27,400	3 40	2,200	25
Boston,	3,044,600	4 16	3,003,200	4 03	2,473,000	3 25
Brookline,	45,600	1 41	21,000	63	6,700	19
Cambridge,	201,400	1 86	207,200	1 90	330,300	3 00
Chelsea,	153,400	3 72	132,500	3 05	154,500	3 39
Everett,	67,200	1 82	68,200	1 81	23,600	61
Lexington,	26,700	4 95	12,100	2 18	19,200	3 36
Lynn,	445,400	4 71	185,700	1 93	119,900	1 23
Malden,	89,300	1 86	219,700	4 49	47,700	96
Medford,	100,600	3 47	91,200	2 99	31,100	97
Melrose,	27,300	1 64	15,600	92	8,400	49
Milton,	29,800	3 51	20,300	2 36	6,600	76
Newton,	65,700	1 51	112,300	2 60	41,300	94
Quincy,	74,000	1 89	80,600	1 98	63,100	1 49
Reading,	4,900	85	10,900	1 60	56,100	7 20
Revere,	51,000	2 14	38,400	1 53	59,000	2 22
Rockland,	104,900	15 00	12,900	1 82	21,300	3 00
Saugus,	43,500	4 63	16,400	1 61	4,300	39
Somerville,	225,800	2 66	72,600	84	112,000	1 26
Stoneham,	35,600	4 81	6,900	92	3,200	42
Waltham,	20,800	70	60,800	2 02	35,600	1 16
Watertown,	27,100	1 72	21,600	1 31	27,700	1 61
Winchester,	6,900	70	8,800	88	4,900	48
Winthrop,	17,100	1 40	30,700	2 41	76,300	5 73
Woburn,	96,900	5 97	311,500	18 90	168,500	10 10
Totals,	$5,063,700	$3 42	$4,799,900	$3 17	$3,909,100	$2 53
Metropolitan District outside of Boston,	$2,019,100	$2 70	$1,797,000	$2 35	$1,436,100	$1 83

It will be noted how generally the per capita loss has fallen,— in some instances to very low figures. The per capita loss in the city of Boston has fallen from $4.16 in 1914 to $3.25 in

1916; in the district outside of Boston it has fallen from $2.70 to $1.83.

I have given the figures showing the decrease in the total number of alarms. The following table shows the decrease in the number of fires causing losses, excluding alarms where no loss followed: —

	1914.	1915.	1916.
Arlington,	35	23	18
Belmont,	9	13	10
Boston,	2,301	2,229	1,855
Brookline,	37	42	45
Cambridge,	264	262	226
Chelsea,	258	263	180
Everett,	61	64	44
Lexington,	10	14	8
Lynn,	319	242	193
Malden,	152	139	103
Medford,	63	57	52
Melrose,	40	25	19
Milton,	16	13	14
Newton,	110	113	87
Quincy,	84	85	44
Reading,	13	14	16
Revere,	68	66	59
Rockland,	14	10	11
Saugus,	25	29	14
Somerville,	109	122	109
Stoneham,	26	21	18
Waltham,	47	61	50
Watertown,	31	29	36
Winchester,	27	20	21
Winthrop,	25	33	18
Woburn,	25	36	38
Totals,	4,169	4,025	3,288

These facts indicate that the work of limiting the fire loss is being successfully done. In this connection it must be borne in mind that this reduction is coincident with a large increase in population, and an especially large increase in the number

of buildings and in the industries carried on throughout the district.

In the report of the Boston Board of Fire Underwriters for the year 1916 occurs the following sentence: "In the list of fires below there are several which occurred in buildings recently equipped by order of the Fire Prevention Commissioner which would without question have resulted very seriously had it not been for the effective operation of the sprinklers."

The work achieved by the Fire Prevention Department will be appreciated more fully if we consider the opinion of an expert on the reduction of the fire loss in January, 1915, about the time that the Fire Prevention Department began its work. In his report published at that time Commissioner Grady of the Boston Fire Department says: —

> Notwithstanding the fact that there were approximately 36,000 inspections made during the year, and in spite of the publicity campaign conducted as to the causes and prevention of fire, there were 716 more alarms than in 1913.
>
> This brings us face to face with the fact that the public, or that part of the public whom we have tried to reach, pay little attention to the advice, warnings and the constant publicity given to the subject by those having fire prevention and extinguishment in charge, consequently the next step is to get legislation under which penalties can be meted out to those whose carelessness causes a fire.
>
> With the incoming motor apparatus and the high-pressure fire service the appliances for extinguishing fire will have about reached their limit of efficiency, so that it is to the prevention of fire that we must devote our energy if the disgracefully enormous losses are to be curtailed.

Prevention and Limitation of Fires.

When hazardous conditions are reported by an inspecting officer the occupants maintaining those conditions are notified by the department at once of the correction desired. Usually prompt attention is paid to such notification. In cases where it is not, an order is issued giving a certain time within which the changes must be made. If the changes are not made within that time prosecution follows. It is a pleasure to say that there have been very few cases where prosecution has been necessary. From July 1, 1916, to July 1, 1917, 217 such orders requiring changes in the maintenance of premises have been issued.

The means used for checking the spread of a fire once started have been: first, to facilitate the approach of the fire department by obtaining suitable entrances, aisles, etc.; second, to compel the installation of extinguishers at proper places throughout the stores and factories; and third, to require the installation of automatic sprinklers. The most effective means of checking fires is undoubtedly the automatic sprinkler. From July 1, 1916, to July 1, 1917, sprinklers were ordered throughout 52 buildings; at the same time partial sprinkler equipment was ordered in 43 other buildings. The Commissioner has hesitated to require sprinkler installation except in urgent cases on account of the very great increase in the cost to the real estate owner. Not only has the material risen very much in price, but the cost of labor has also increased so that the total cost is from two to three times what it was in 1915. In view of these facts it has seemed to the Commissioner that he should order sprinklers only in cases of extreme urgency where loss of life was in question. Many difficulties attend the matter of ordering automatic sprinklers in the cities of the district; for example, if a street is paved it is not allowable to open it up for the sake of making water connections within five years. For that reason just before the pavement is laid it becomes necessary to make as thorough an inspection of the district as is possible, and then to order sprinklers in such buildings as may seem to be in need of them; and it becomes necessary to anticipate the needs of the ensuing five years. In such cases unless there is urgency it has been the policy of the Commissioner to require water connection with the main in the street from the real estate owner, and to leave the matter of sprinklers for some future time. That plan is apparently working well. Another serious embarrassment in ordering sprinklers is that in making leases the landlord places on the tenant the obligation of executing all changes and repairs required by State or city officials. Sometimes a building is reported for sprinklers when a lease has but a year or two to run. It becomes then a question whether to commit the serious injustice of placing the entire expense of sprinkler installation on a lessee who has so short a term for the enjoyment of the premises, or to run the risk of a fire in the meantime. Questions like these confront the Commissioner all the time.

Hazards outside the Control of the Commissioner.

A serious limitation on the power of the Fire Prevention Commissioner is contained in the last two lines of section 10 of the fire prevention law which provides that no sprinkler order shall apply to any building unless four or more persons live or are usually employed therein above the second floor. The result of this provision is that sprinklers cannot be ordered in a building that is not over two stories in height, or in one where four or more people do not live or work above the second floor. It excludes from his control many woodworking establishments and very many storehouses, some of them six or seven stories in height, for the reason that although employees are constantly going up and down in such storehouses no one can be said to be usually employed above the second floor. In the interest of fire prevention this limitation should be removed.

From Jan. 1, 1916, to July 1, 1917, taking into account fires in the city of Boston where the loss was $10,000 or more, $750,000 of that loss occurred in buildings within the jurisdiction of the Commissioner, $2,430,000 occurred in buildings not within his control, and, in buildings where his authority is limited by the provision above stated, the loss in such fires amounted to $1,810,000. It is apparent then that the fires in such buildings cause a very large proportion of the entire loss in the city of Boston, and that it is most desirable to give the Commissioner authority to protect such buildings against fire.

Fireworks.

This spring it was proposed by the Fire Commissioner of the city of New York to the officials of all large cities throughout the country to abolish the sale and use of fireworks throughout the present war. The sale and use of fireworks in the city of New York are not now allowed. It seemed to the Fire Prevention Commissioner that any action in this matter should affect the entire State, and he suggested to the committee having in charge House Bill No. 1996 to incorporate the following section: —

The governor, with the advice and consent of the council, shall have power by proclamation to prohibit or regulate the use of fireworks and firecrackers throughout the commonwealth at such times as he may deem the public interest may require. Such prohibition or regulation shall continue until revoked by the governor. Subject to such prohibition or regulation as may be proclaimed by the governor, the authority of cities, towns and officials under existing law to prohibit or regulate the use of fireworks and firecrackers shall not be abridged or affected by the provisions of this section.

That was done and power was given the Governor to prohibit the use of fireworks or firecrackers should he judge it wise.

Factory Fires.

In my second annual report I stated that an attempt had been made to control factory fires through the co-operation of the labor unions. It is in the power of the Commissioner to forbid smoking in factories; but it seemed to him a better plan to stimulate the interest of the wage earners in the attempt to save other wage earners from losing their work. In that report I stated also that factory fires for the first five months in 1916 showed a decrease over the first five months of 1915 from 113 to 63. It is gratifying for me to be able to say that the records of the first five months of the present year show only 35 factory fires. Smoking is the common cause of factory fires, and the form in which most of them originate is this: a worker stands in front of a blower smoking a cigarette and some one in authority approaches, and in order to avoid detection the worker carelessly throws the cigarette into the blower. In the city of Lynn, especially, that has been reported as a cause of factory fires. I have no doubt it is equally so elsewhere. The remedy for that is an appeal to the conscience of the worker. The results of such an appeal made in 1915 have been so satisfactory that that method will still be followed. In the meantime in many factories up-to-date proprietors or managers are providing a properly safeguarded room where the men may smoke during the noon hour. This is to be recommended, not only for humanitarian reasons but also because it is a real step in the work of fire prevention.

Control of Explosives in 1917.

During the early months of 1917 the Commissioner caused an examination to be made of all magazines in the city of Boston in which explosives were kept. This examination was made by the Deputy Commissioner and was very thorough. It disclosed a great variation in construction and in care used in guarding the magazines. Later, a theft by certain boys in Roxbury of some sticks of dynamite forced upon the Commissioner the belief that the entire matter must be handled in a radical fashion. Governor McCall was very much interested in the work, and by the Governor and Council an appropriation was made that enabled the Commissioner to employ an explosive expert, Mr. N. Richardson, to make a further examination of every magazine in the entire district. In the outside cities and towns it was found that dynamite was kept even more carelessly than in the city of Boston.

No magazine would be proof against evil-disposed persons who desired to enter it, and who were fully prepared for that purpose. For that reason it seemed that the keeping of dynamite should be limited entirely to magazines that were guarded day and night. In the city of Boston there were 24 magazines; of these, the licenses were revoked for all but 5, where guards were maintained; outside the city of Boston there were 74 magazines, and these were reduced to 13, where guards were maintained.

In order to accommodate persons using small quantities of dynamite arrangements were made with the proprietors of guarded magazines in different localities to accept from them such small quantities of dynamite as they might have on hand. A careful account of the dynamite stored in these magazines by each person is kept by the proprietors of the magazines so that at any time it is possible for the Fire Prevention Commissioner, or any person to whom he has delegated the work, to visit the magazine and learn just who is keeping dynamite there. It is further arranged that the proprietors of guarded magazines shall receive dynamite from no person who has not a license to use it.

In this work of guarding high explosives the assistance of the

wholesale dealers has been of the greatest importance. Although the regulations have necessarily placed some restraint on their business they have cheerfully joined in and have made the reports desired by the Commissioner. They sell to no one who has not a license to buy.

In this way the storage and use of dynamite has been strictly regulated, and no doubt this regulation has contributed its share towards the freedom from dynamite outrages that the Metropolitan District has enjoyed during the past six months.

At the present time a standard form of construction for magazines and a standard lock to safeguard them are under consideration.

The railroad agents have also done their share by advising the heads of fire departments immediately in the different cities and towns of the arrival at their freight yards of consignments of explosives.

In order to show the fine spirit with which the contractors of Boston have entered into the plan to safeguard dynamite I desire to give a quotation from a meeting held by a committee of them April 10, 1917, and the names of the contractors constituting the committee: —

It was the sense of the meeting that every precaution be taken by the consumers of dynamite to protect the welfare of the Commonwealth, and that a concerted effort be made to co-operate with the Fire Prevention Commissioner in handling this particular problem.

Respectfully submitted,

Hugh Nawn, *Chairman*,
William J. Barry,
John C. Coleman,
Martin J. Finn,
Bernard Malone,
Ransom Rowe,
Thomas F. Welch,
E. L. Webber, *Dynamite Manufacturers' Representative*,
Committee.

Shipment of High Explosives from Boston Harbor.

Throughout his term of office the influence of the Commissioner has been exerted against the shipment of high explosives from Boston Harbor. It did not seem to him that the increase in trade would justify the danger of great destruction of life and property that would be connected with the handling of such high explosives. He was confirmed in his view by the New Jersey explosions.

At the present time the only substance approaching high explosives that is shipped from the port of Boston is benzol, from a plant in Canada, that arrives at a certain time at the docks in East Boston. Notice is at once given by the railroads to the District Chief of the Boston Fire Department for that district, and under his direction the benzol is taken on lighters and loaded on a steamer from the outer side, in order to minimize the danger to wharf property.

Effect of Fire Prevention Measures on Insurance.

The general effect of fire prevention measures is to lower the rate of insurance. That is done mainly through the installation of sprinklers. Three years ago sprinklers might be installed at a price that would recoup the proprietor the cost of installation in seven or eight years from lower insurance rates. To-day that is not so, and the sole object achieved by sprinklers is the greater safety of property and life. I am giving below a table that shows the percentage reduction in insurance rates allowed in Boston during the past year on buildings sprinklered throughout or in part.

Part of Building Sprinklered.	Insurance Reduction (Per Cent.).	Number of Buildings.
Throughout,	12½	5
Throughout,	15	27
Throughout,	20	52
Throughout,	22½	3
Throughout,	30	2
Basement,	2½	3

Part of Building Sprinklered.	Insurance Reduction (Per Cent.).	Number of Buildings.
Basement,	5	14
Basement,	7½	1
Basement and sub-basement,	10	1
Basement and first floor,	5	2
Basement and first floor,	7½	1
Basement and first floor,	15	1
Basement and second floor,	5	1
Basement and fourth floor,	5	1
Basement and partial,	10	3
Partial,	7½	1
Partial,	5	1
No allowance made: —		
Throughout,	–	35
Partial,	–	37

In connection with the reduction in insurance rates it is well to remember that in Boston when a building is equipped throughout with a system of automatic sprinklers, thus reducing the insurance rate on the premises by 20 per cent., the proprietors of adjoining buildings are entitled to a reduction in their insurance rates amounting to 20 per cent. of the proportion of the rate imposed for exposure hazard from this building.

Water-front Conditions in Boston.

There is always the danger of a serious conflagration along the water front in the city of Boston. A great deal has been done to remedy that by forbidding the sale or delivery of gasoline and other inflammable fluids at the wharves to boats in the docks. The sale of such fluids has been limited to certain boats stationed in the harbor and maintained under strict conditions. Permission has been sought to deliver gasoline in tanks and barrels at the wharves, but the delivery of such tanks and barrels means the return of empties at the same places. It is said to have been empty tanks that caused the disastrous freight yard fire in Charlestown in March, 1916. For these reasons the Commissioner has refused to allow the de-

livery of gasoline even in drums and barrels. There is also the fact that the gasoline would be emptied from the drums and barrels by the pleasure or fishing boats into their tanks while lying at the wharves.

The present system is not wholly satisfactory, and it is hoped ultimately to establish a gasoline sales station either on an island in the harbor or at some point so situated that it will furnish no danger of fire and will convenience the boats.

In General.

After a concerted effort for the regulation of hazardous trades, the protection of unsafe buildings, the improvements in maintenance, and the careful use of fire, evidence of satisfactory results are at hand and presage a large economic saving.

But this desirable effect of fire prevention depends to a large extent upon the willingness of the people to continue to cooperate and accept the decisions of the Commissioner, even though it means a moderate investment for the protection of property.

Oftentimes, as is illustrated by the reduction in exposure hazard due to the installation of automatic sprinklers, this expenditure will not only insure self-protection, but it will also greatly reduce the hazard of the neighboring buildings.

The Commissioner, therefore, asks for assistance towards the reduction of alarms, the reduction of fires, the reduction of loss, and finally the reduction of the cost of insurance.

The expense of the department for 1916 was $1\frac{1}{3}$ cents for each person in the Metropolitan District.

APPENDICES.

Appendix I.

CITIES AND TOWNS IN THE METROPOLITAN FIRE PREVENTION DISTRICT.

The following is a list of the cities and towns included in the Metropolitan Fire Prevention District, with the population according to the census of 1915:—

Cities.	
Boston,	745,439
Cambridge,	108,822
Chelsea,	43,426
Everett,	37,718
Lynn,	95,803
Malden,	48,907
Medford,	30,509
Melrose,	16,880
Newton,	43,113
Quincy,	40,674
Revere,	25,178
Somerville,	86,854
Waltham,	30,154
Woburn,	16,410
	1,369,887
Towns.	
Arlington,	14,889
Belmont,	8,081
Brookline,	33,490
Lexington,	5,538
Milton,	8,600
Reading,	6,805
Rockland,	7,074
Saugus,	10,226
Stoneham,	7,489
Watertown,	16,515
Winchester,	10,005
Winthrop,	12,758
	141,470
Total population,	1,511,357

Appendix II.

MEMBERS OF THE FIRE PREVENTION DEPARTMENT IN THE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT.

Fire Prevention Department for the Metropolitan District.

Commissioner, ... John A. O'Keefe.
Deputy Commissioner, ... Michael A. Murphy.
Secretary, ... Harry E. Lake.

Heads of Fire Departments in the Metropolitan District.

City or Town.	Head of Fire Department.	Central Fire Station.
Arlington, ...	Chief Walter H. Peirce, . . .	1003 Massachusetts Ave.
Belmont, ...	Chief John F. Leonard, . . .	Leonard St.
Boston, ...	Commissioner John Grady, . .	40 Bristol St.
	Chief Peter F. McDonough, . .	Mason St.
	Senior Deputy John O. Taber, .	Fort Hill Sq.
	Junior Deputy Daniel F. Sennott,	Winslow and Dudley sts., Roxbury.
District 1, . . .	Wm. E. Riley, ...	Paris St., East Boston.
District 2, . . .	Allan J. Macdonald, . . .	Main St., Charlestown.
District 3, . . .	Stephen J. Ryder, ...	Pittsburgh St., South Boston.
District 4, . . .	Edward J. Shallow, . . .	Bulfinch St.
District 5, . . .	Albert J. Caulfield, ...	Mason St.
District 6, . . .	Frank Jordan, ...	Dorchester St., South Boston.
District 7, . . .	Peter E. Walsh, ...	Warren Ave.
District 8, . . .	Wm. J. Gaffey, ...	Tremont St., Roxbury.
District 9, . . .	Joseph H. Kenney, . . .	Dudley St., Roxbury.
District 10, . . .	Walter M. McLean, ...	Harvard St., Dorchester.
District 11, . . .	Henry A. Fox, ...	Harvard Ave., Allston.
District 12, . . .	Michael T. Mulligan, . . .	Centre St., Jamaica Plain.
District 13, . . .	Michael Kennedy, ...	Cor. Washington and Poplar sts., Roslindale.
District 14, . . .	Maurice Heffernan, ...	Peabody Sq., Dorchester.
District 15, . . .	Joseph A. Dolan, ...	Cor. Harvard Ave. and Winthrop St., Hyde Park.
Brookline, . . .	Commissioner W. W. Estabrook, .	340 Washington St.
	Chief Geo. H. Johnson, . . .	340 Washington St.
Cambridge, . . .	Chief James M. Casey, . . .	Inman Sq.

HEADS OF FIRE DEPARTMENTS IN THE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT — Con.

CITY OR TOWN.	Head of Fire Department.	Central Fire Station.
Chelsea,	Chief David M. Hudson,	307 Chestnut St.
Everett,	Chief Joseph T. Swan,	Broadway.
Lexington,	Chief Edward W. Taylor,	5 Main St.
Lynn,	Chief Edward E. Chase,	Cor. Baker and Franklin sts.
Malden,	Commissioner John H. Hannan,	Mountain Ave.
	Chief John T. Nicolls,	388 Main St.
Medford,	Chief Charles M. Bacon,	1 South St.
Melrose,	Chief Joseph Edwards,	576 Main St.
Milton,	Chief J. Harry Holmes,	Danton Ave.
Newton,	Chief W. B. Randlett,	27 Willow St.
Quincy,	Chief Faxon I. Billings,	Quincy Ave.
Reading,	Chief O. O. Ordway,	11 Pleasant St.
Revere,	Chief A. L. Kimball,	Broadway.
Rockland,	Chief Fred Chapman,	Union St.
Saugus,	Chief Ernest Stuart,	Woodbury Ave.
Somerville,	Chief Sewall M. Rich,	261 Medford St.
Stoneham,	Chief A. J. Smith,	1 Tidd St.
Waltham,	Chief Geo. L. Johnson,	Moody St.
Watertown,	Chief John W. O'Hearn,	99 Main St.
Winchester,	Chief David H. DeCourcy,	Mt. Vernon St.
Winthrop,	Chief F. W. F. Woollcott,	31 Pauline St.
Woburn,	Chief Frank E. Tracy,	Winn St.

BUILDING COMMISSIONERS AND INSPECTORS IN THE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT.

Arlington,	William Gratto.
Belmont,	James R. Logan.
Boston,	Commissioner Patrick O'Hearn.
Brookline,	Commissioner E. Lyon.
Cambridge,	Jeremiah Downey.
Chelsea,	James C. Denning.
Everett,	A. T. Macduff.
Lexington,	William Gratto.
Lynn,	Commissioner George A. Cornet.
Malden,	C. George W. Bagge.
Medford,	Frank B. Blodgett.
Melrose,	William S. Allen.
Milton,	G. E. Burt.

Building Commissioners and Inspectors in the Metropolitan District — Con.

Newton,	Commissioner Walter R. Forbush.
Quincy,	Warren S. Parker.
Reading,	Robert Parker.
Revere,	William H. Graham.
Rockland,	Fred Chapman.
Saugus,	Daniel Willis.
Somerville,	Commissioner Geo. L. Dudley.
Stoneham,	Albert Smith.
Waltham,	A. L. Cole.
Watertown,	William H. Benjamin.
Winchester,	Maurice Dineen.
Winthrop,	Charles F. Hargrave.
Woburn,	Henry Macksey.