

EXHIBIT I.

VIEWERS' REPORT

—IN—

DITCH PROCEEDINGS.

" 6 "
Rathbun Ditch
No 14

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

Filed August 12 1891
E. W. 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. 14 1

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD		
	<i>Feet</i>	<i>Feet</i>	<i>Feet</i>		<i>Dollars</i>	<i>Cents</i>	
Between Stake No. <u>0</u>	<u>1.3</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>3.3</u>				
and Stake No. <u>1</u>	<u>1.4</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>14</u>		<u>8</u>	✓
<u>2</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>15</u>		"	✓
<u>3</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>16</u>		"	✓
<u>4</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>16</u>		"	✓
<u>5</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>16</u>		"	✓
<u>6</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>18</u>		"	✓
<u>7</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>18</u>		"	✓
<u>8</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>18</u>		"	✓
<u>9</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>19</u>		"	✓
<u>10</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>21</u>		"	✓
<u>11</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>18</u>		"	✓
<u>12</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>18</u>		"	✓
<u>13</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>22</u>		"	✓
<u>14</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>23</u>		"	✓
<u>15</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>23</u>		"	✓
<u>16</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>22</u>		"	✓
<u>17</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>22</u>		"	✓
<u>18</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>23</u>		"	✓
<u>19</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>23</u>		"	✓
				<u>365</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. 14 (2)

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD	
	<i>Feet</i>	<i>Feet</i>	<i>Feet</i>		Dollar	Cents
Between Stake No. <u>19</u>				<u>365</u>		
and Stake No. <u>20</u>						
<u>21</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>22</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>23</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>24</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>25</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>26</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>27</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>28</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>29</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>30</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.4</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>31</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>32</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>33</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>34</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>35</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>36</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>37</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>38</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>✓</u>
	<u>2.2</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>Canid Pond</u>				<u>857</u>		
					<u>Totals</u>	

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. 14 3

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD	
	<i>Feet</i>	<i>Feet</i>	<i>Feet</i>		<i>Dollars</i>	<i>Cents</i>
Between Stake No. <u>38</u>						
and Stake No. <u>39</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>857</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>40</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>41</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>42</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>43</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>44</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>45</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>46</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.4</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>47</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>48</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>49</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>50</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>51</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>52</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>53</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>54</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>55</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>56</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>57</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
				<u>1048</u>		

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. 14 4

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT <i>Feet</i>	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM <i>Feet</i>	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP <i>Feet</i>	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD	
Between Stake No. <u>57</u>					<i>Dollor</i>	<i>Centi</i>
and Stake No. <u>58</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>28</u>		<u>8</u>
<u>59</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.9</u>	<u>33</u>		<u>8</u>
<u>60</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.7</u>	<u>35</u>		<u>8</u>
<u>61</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>30</u>		<u>8</u>
<u>62</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>22</u>		<u>8</u>
<u>63</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.8</u>	<u>28</u>		<u>8</u>
<u>64</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.9</u>	<u>35</u>		<u>8</u>
<u>65</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.6</u>	<u>32</u>		<u>8</u>
<u>66</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.6</u>	<u>31</u>		<u>8</u>
<u>67</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>28</u>		<u>8</u>
<u>68</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>25</u>		<u>8</u>
<u>69</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.7</u>	<u>30</u>		<u>8</u>
<u>70</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.6</u>	<u>32</u>		<u>8</u>
<u>71</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.9</u>	<u>35</u>		<u>8</u>
<u>72</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>11</u>		<u>8</u>
<u>73</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.7</u>	<u>6</u>		<u>8</u>
<u>74</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.9</u>	<u>5</u>		<u>8</u>
<u>75</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.8</u>	<u>5</u>		<u>8</u>
<u>76</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.9</u>	<u>5</u>		<u>8</u>
				<u>1484</u>		
					<i>Totals</i>	

Port Ford = 1048

x

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. 14

(3)

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD	
Between Stake No. <u>76</u>					Dollars Cents	
and Stake No. <u>77</u>	3.0	2.0	5.0	1484		
<u>78</u>	3.0	2.0	5.0	x		
<u>79</u>	2.9	2.0	4.9			
<u>80</u>	2.5	2.0	4.5			
<u>81</u>	2.6	2.0	4.6			
<u>82</u>	2.4	2.0	4.4			
<u>83</u>	2.5	2.0	4.5			
<u>84</u>	2.2	2.0	4.2	x	16	
<u>85</u>	2.0	2.0	4.0		22	
<u>86</u>	2.0	2.0	4.0		22	
<u>87</u>	1.9	2.0	3.9		22	
<u>88</u>	1.8	2.0	3.8		21	
<u>89</u>	1.8	2.0	3.8		19	
<u>90</u>	1.6	2.0	3.6		18	
<u>91</u>	1.5	2.0	3.5		16	
<u>92</u>	1.5	2.0	3.5		15	
<u>93</u>	1.3	2.0	3.3		14	
<u>94</u>	1.0	2.0	3.0		12	
<u>95</u>	1.1	2.0	3.1		11	
				1727		
						Totals

1727