

File No. 9703.

CORRESPONDENCE.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS,
SUB-DEPARTMENT OF CITY ENGINEER.

Baltimore, March 8th, 1909.

Edgar Allan Poe, Esq.,
City Solicitor.

Dear Sir:-

7255

The attached letter from Mr. Hood is respectfully referred. Where Mr. Hood is renewing tracks which he took up under an order from the Sewerage Commission, in my judgment, it is absolutely necessary that a City Inspector be present during the renewals of these tracks, as, otherwise, the tracks will be put on improper grades. Therefore, under any conditions, I shall insist upon the Inspector being on the ground.

Mr. Hood's contention is that the tracks being renewed on account of work of the Sewerage Commission, that the Sewerage Commission should bear the expense of such inspection and not the Railways Company. Is Mr. Hood right in his contention, in your opinion, and should I charge the time of the Inspector against the Railways Company or against the Sewerage Commission.

I shall thank you to let me have an answer to this question as soon as possible.

Please return Mr. Hood's letter with your reply.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) B. T. Fendall,
City Engineer.

File No. 9703.THE UNITED RAILWAYS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
OF BALTIMORE.ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT,
1008 CONTINENTAL TRUST BUILDING.

Baltimore, March 6th, 1909.

Mr. B. T. Fendall,
City Engineer.

7256

Dear Sir:-

I am in receipt of yours of the 2nd with respect to notifying