

Ditch No. 11

EXHIBIT I.

VIEWERS' REPORT

DITCH PROCEEDINGS.

11

ESTIMATED COST PER
CUBIC YARD

WIDTH OF CURVE YARDS
REMOVED

WIDTH OF CUT
AT TOP

WIDTH OF CUT
AT BOTTOM

DEPTH OF CUT

SECTION

No. 686.— Pioneer Press Co., St. Paul, Minn.

Filed September 26-1890
W. M. Putnam
County Auditor

EXHIBIT 1 OF VIEWERS' REPORT IN DITCH PROCEEDINGS, Showing Estimated Depth of Cut, Width, No. of Cubic Yards Removed and Cost of same, in Ditch No. 11

(6)

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT Feet	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM Feet	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP Feet	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD
Between Stake No. <u>96</u>				Forward 2826	
and Stake No. <u>97</u> ✓	3.4	2.0	5.4	21	\$.08
<u>98</u> ✓	3.5	2.0	5.5	25	\$.08
<u>99</u> ✓	3.6	2.0	5.6	27	\$.08
<u>100</u> ✓	3.6	2.0	5.6	30	\$.08
<u>101</u> ✓	3.7	2.0	5.7	33	\$.08
<u>102</u> ✓	3.5	2.0	5.5	32	\$.08
<u>103</u> ✓	3.9	2.0	5.9	32	\$.08
<u>104</u> ✓	3.8	2.0	5.8	35	\$.08
<u>105</u> ✓	3.5	2.0	5.5	36	\$.08
<u>106</u> ✓	3.9	2.0	5.9	37	\$.08
<u>107</u> ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	48	\$.08
<u>108</u> ✓	3.6	2.0	5.6	40	\$.08
<u>109</u> ✓	3.8	2.0	5.8	46	\$.08
<u>110</u> ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	38	\$.08
<u>111</u> ✓	3.4	2.0	5.4	31	\$.08
<u>112</u> ✓	3.2	2.0	5.2	37	\$.08
<u>113</u> ✓	3.2	2.0	5.2	29	\$.08
<u>114</u> ✓	3.5	2.0	5.5	28	\$.08
<u>115</u> ✓	3.5	2.0	5.5	29	\$.08
				3448	
<i>Totals</i>					

EXHIBIT 1 OF VIEWERS' REPORT IN DITCH PROCEEDINGS, Showing Estimated Depth of Cut, Width, No. of Cubic Yards Removed and Cost of same, in Ditch No. 11

(2)

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT Feet	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM Feet	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP Feet	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD
Between Stake No. <u>115</u>				Forward 3448	
and Stake No. <u>116</u> ✓	3.5	2.0	5.5	30	\$.08
117 ✓	3.4	2.0	5.4	24	\$.08
118 ✓	3.4	2.0	5.4	24	\$.08
119 ✓	3.6	2.0	5.6	31	\$.08
120 ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	29	\$.08
121 ✓	3.5	2.0	5.5	27	\$.08
122 ✓	3.7	2.0	5.7	29	\$.08
123 ✓	3.7	2.0	5.7	25	\$.08
124 ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	23	\$.08
125 ✓	3.2	2.0	5.2	22	\$.08
126 ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	22	\$.08
127 ✓	3.1	2.0	5.1	19	\$.08
128 ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	20	\$.08
129 ✓	3.0	2.0	5.0	20	\$.08
130 ✓	3.2	2.0	5.2	19	\$.08
131 ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	21	\$.08
132 ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	23	\$.08
133 ✓	3.7	2.0	5.7	24	\$.08
134 ✓	3.6	2.0	5.6	26	\$.08
135 ✓	3.5	2.0	5.5	23	\$.08
136 ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	20	\$.08
137 ✓	3.5	2.0	5.5	20	\$.08
138 ✓	3.4	2.0	5.4	21	\$.08
139 ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	20	\$.08
140 ✓	3.4	2.0	5.4	19	\$.08
141 ✓	3.2	2.0	5.2	18	\$.08
142 ✓	3.4	2.0	5.4	18	\$.08
143 ✓	3.1	2.0	5.1	18	\$.08
				4093	
				4093	
					Totals

EXHIBIT 1 OF VIEWERS' REPORT IN DITCH PROCEEDINGS, Showing Estimated Depth of Cut, Width, No. of Cubic Yards Removed and Cost of same, in Ditch No. 11

(8)

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT Feet	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM Feet	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP Feet	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD
Between Stake No. 143				Forward 4093	
and Stake No. 144 ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	17	\$.08
145 ✓	3.1	2.0	5.1	16	\$.08
146 ✓	3.2	2.0	5.2	18	\$.08
147 ✓	2.8	2.0	4.8	16	\$.08
148 ✓	2.9	2.0	4.9	14	\$.08
149 ✓	3.0	2.0	5.0	13	\$.08
150 ✓	2.9	2.0	4.9	14	\$.08
151 ✓	3.0	2.0	5.0	14	\$.08
152 ✓	2.9	2.0	4.9	13	\$.08
153 ✓	3.0	2.0	5.0	14	\$.08
154 ✓	3.0	2.0	5.0	16	\$.08
155 ✓	2.8	2.0	4.8	37	\$.08
156 ✓	3.1	2.0	5.1	38	\$.08
157 ✓	3.2	2.0	5.2	43	\$.08
158 ✓	2.9	2.0	4.9	30	\$.08
159 ✓	3.0	2.0	5.0	39	\$.08
160 ✓	3.4	2.0	5.4	43	\$.08
161 ✓	2.9	2.0	4.9	44	\$.08
162 ✓	3.1	2.0	5.1	39	\$.08
163 ✓	2.9	2.0	4.9	39	\$.08
164 ✓	3.1	2.0	5.1	39	\$.08
165 ✓	3.2	2.0	5.2	42	\$.08
166 ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	44	\$.08
167 ✓	3.1	2.0	5.1	43	\$.08
168 ✓	3.1	2.0	5.1	41	\$.08
169 ✓	3.0	2.0	5.0	40	\$.08
170 ✓	3.1	2.0	5.1	40	\$.08
				4900	
				4899	
				129	
				494	
				4	
					Totals

Get hand

EXHIBIT 1 OF VIEWERS' REPORT IN DITCH PROCEEDINGS, Showing Estimated Depth of Cut, Width, No. of Cubic Yards Removed and

Cost of same, in Ditch No. 11

(9)

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD	
	Feet	Feet	Feet			
Between Stake No. 120				Forward 4900		
and Stake No. 121 ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	43	\$.08
172 ✓	3.0	2.0	5.0	42	\$.08
173 ✓	3.1	2.0	5.1	40	\$.08
174 ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	43	\$.08
175 ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	45	\$.08
176 ✓	3.2	2.0	5.2	44	\$.08
177 ✓	3.2	2.0	5.2	43	\$.08
178 ✓	3.4	2.0	5.4	45	\$.08
179 ✓	3.2	2.0	5.2	45	\$.08
180 ✓	3.1	2.0	5.1	42	\$.08
181 ✓	3.2	2.0	5.2	40	\$.08
182 ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	44	\$.08
183 ✓	3.4	2.0	5.4	46	\$.08
184 ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	46	\$.08
185 ✓	3.4	2.0	5.4	46	\$.08
186 ✓	3.3	2.0	5.4	46	\$.08
187 ✓	3.5	2.0	5.5	47	\$.08
188 ✓	3.5	2.0	5.5	50	\$.08
189 ✓	3.5	2.0	5.5	50	\$.08
190 ✓	3.5	2.0	5.5	50	\$.08
191 ✓	3.5	2.0	5.5	50	\$.08
192 ✓	3.4	2.0	5.4	49	\$.08
193 ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	46	\$.08
194 ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	45	\$.08
195 ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	45	\$.08
196 ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	45	\$.08
197 ✓	3.3	2.0	5.3	45	\$.08
198 ✓	3.1	2.0	5.1	43	\$.08
				6165		
					<i>Totals</i>	

Ballard

EXHIBIT 1 OF VIEWERS' REPORT IN DITCH PROCEEDINGS, Showing Estimated Depth of Cut, Width, No. of Cubic Yards Removed and Cost of same, in Ditch No. 11

(10)

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT Feet	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM Feet	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP Feet	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD
Between Stake No. <u>198</u>				Forward <u>6165</u>	
and Stake No. <u>199</u> ✓	3.2	2.0	5.2	42	\$.08
<u>200</u> ✓	3.0	2.0	5.0	41	\$.08
<u>201</u> ✓	2.6	2.0	4.6	35	\$.08
<u>202</u> ✓	2.1	2.0	4.1	28	\$.08
<u>203</u> ✓	2.2	2.0	4.2	24	\$.08
<u>204</u> ✓	2.3	2.0	4.3	26	\$.08
<u>205</u> ✓				10	\$.08
<u>206</u> ✓	In	Lake			
<u>207</u> ✓	"	"			
<u>208</u> ✓	2.5	2.0	4.5	10	\$.08
<u>209</u> ✓				10	\$.08
<u>210</u> ✓	2.3	2.0	4.3	14	\$.08
<u>211</u> ✓	2.2	2.0	4.2	26	\$.08
<u>212</u> ✓	2.1	2.0	4.1	24	\$.08
<u>213</u> ✓	2.4	2.0	4.4	26	\$.08
<u>214</u> ✓	2.5	2.0	4.5	29	\$.08
<u>215</u> ✓	2.9	2.0	4.9	33	\$.08
<u>216</u> ✓	3.1	2.0	5.1	39	\$.08
<u>217</u> ✓	2.5	2.0	4.5	35	\$.08
<u>218</u> ✓	2.5	2.0	4.5	30	\$.08
<u>219</u> ✓	2.5	2.0	4.5	30	\$.08
<u>220</u> ✓	2.0	2.0	4.0	20	\$.08
<u>221</u> ✓	2.0	2.0	4.0	22	\$.08
<u>222</u> ✓	1.7	2.0	3.7	10	\$.08
<u>223</u> ✓	1.8	2.0	3.8	10	\$.08
<u>224</u> ✓	1.9	2.0	3.9	12	\$.08
<u>225</u> ✓	2.6	2.0	4.6	22	\$.08
<u>226</u> ✓	2.0	2.0	4.0	27	\$.08
				<u>6800</u>	
<i>Totals</i>					

EXHIBIT 1 OF VIEWERS' REPORT IN DITCH PROCEEDINGS, Showing Estimated Depth of Cut, Width, No. of Cubic Yards Removed and Cost of same, in Ditch No.

(11)

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT Feet	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM Feet	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP Feet	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD
Between Stake No. 226				Forward 6800	
and Stake No. 227 ✓	1.9	2.0	3.9	18	\$.08
228 ✓	2.2	2.0	4.2	23	\$.08
229 ✓	1.8	2.0	3.8	20	\$.08
230 ✓	2.0	2.0	4.0	19	\$.08
231 ✓	2.1	2.0	4.1	20	\$.08
232 ✓	2.4	2.0	4.4	26	\$.08
233 ✓	2.2	2.0	4.2	17	\$.08
234 ✓	2.4	2.0	4.4	23	\$.08
235 ✓	2.6	2.0	4.6	30	\$.08
236 ✓	2.4	2.0	4.4	30	\$.08
237 ✓	2.3	2.0	4.3	28	\$.08
238 ✓	2.0	2.0	4.0	15	\$.08
239 ✓	2.1	2.0	4.1	15	\$.08
240 ✓	2.2	2.0	4.2	24	\$.08
241 ✓	2.3	2.0	4.3	26	\$.08
242 ✓	1.8	2.0	3.8	23	\$.08
243 ✓	1.6	2.0	3.6	18	\$.08
244 ✓	1.6	2.0	3.6	15	\$.08
245 ✓	2.5	2.0	4.5	18	\$.08
246 ✓	2.6	2.0	4.6	31	\$.08
247 ✓	2.1	2.0	4.1	28	\$.08
248 ✓	2.1	2.0	4.1	23	\$.08
249 ✓	2.2	2.0	4.2	15	\$.08
250 ✓	1.3	2.0	3.3	19	\$.08
251 ✓	1.8	2.0	3.8	12	\$.08
252 ✓	2.0	2.0	4.0	17	\$.08
253 ✓	1.7	2.0	3.7	20	\$.08
254 ✓	1.4	2.0	3.9	15	\$.08
				7398	

Totals

EXHIBIT 1 OF VIEWERS' REPORT IN DITCH PROCEEDINGS, Showing Estimated Depth of Cut, Width, No. of Cubic Yards Removed and Cost of same, in Ditch No. 11

(12)

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT Feet	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM Feet	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP Feet	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD
Between Stake No. <u>254</u>				<u>Forward</u> 7398	
and Stake No. <u>255</u> ✓	2.6	2.0	4.6	27	\$.08
<u>256</u> ✓	2.7	2.0	4.7	32	\$.08
<u>257</u> ✓	2.3	2.0	4.3	30	\$.08
<u>258</u> ✓	2.1	2.0	4.1	25	\$.08
<u>259</u> ✓	1.8	2.0	3.8	22	\$.08
<u>260</u> ✓	1.7	2.0	3.7	19	\$.08
<u>261</u> ✓	2.4	2.0	4.4	23	\$.08
<u>262</u> ✓	2.4	2.0	4.4	28	\$.08
<u>263</u> ✓	1.6	2.0	3.6	22	\$.08
<u>264</u> ✓	1.1	2.0	3.1	12	\$.08
<u>265</u> ✓	1.5	2.0	3.5	11	\$.08
<u>266</u> ✓	2.1	2.0	4.1	19	\$.08
<u>267</u> ✓	1.7	2.0	3.7	20	\$.08
<u>268</u> ✓	2.1	2.0	4.1	21	\$.08
<u>269</u> ✓	2.2	2.0	4.2	22	\$.08
<u>269+12</u> ✓	2.1	2.0	4.1	4	\$.08
<u>Total</u>				8735	@ \$.08 = \$698.80
				7735	618.80
				7634	
					Totals