

Ditch No. 16

EXHIBIT I.

VIEWERS' REPORT

—IN—

DITCH PROCEEDINGS.

'C'

Ditch No. 10.

*Excavation and
Estimate*

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

Filed April 26-1892

G. M. Putnam

County Auditor

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

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD		
					\$	cts	
Between Stake No..... 0	2.4	2.0	4.4				✓
and Stake No..... 1	1.9	2.0	3.9	24.4	0.05		✓
2	2.3	2.0	4.3	23.3	0.08		✓
3	2.2	2.0	4.2	25.8	0.08		✓
4	2.1	2.0	4.1	24.4	0.08		✓
5	1.8	2.0	3.8	21.5	0.08		✓
6	1.9	2.0	3.9	20.0	0.08		✓
7	2.2	2.0	4.2	23.0	0.08		✓
8	2.2	2.0	4.2	25.2	0.08		✓
9	2.2	2.0	4.2	25.2	0.08		✓
10	2.4	2.0	4.4	25.6	0.08		✓
11	2.5	2.0	4.5	28.2	0.08		✓
12	2.6	2.0	4.6	30.9	0.08		✓
13	2.6	2.0	4.6	31.7	0.08		✓
14	2.7	2.0	4.7	32.3	0.08		✓
15	2.7	2.0	4.7	36.3	0.08		✓
16	2.8	2.0	4.8	34.1	0.08		✓
17	3.0	2.0	5.0	37.0	0.08		✓
18	2.9	2.0	4.9	38.0	0.08		✓
19	3.1	2.0	5.1	40.1	0.08		✓
				547.0	0.08		
							Totals

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

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD	
					\$	Cts.
<i>Between Stake No.....19</i>	<i>3.1</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>5.1</i>	<i>577.0</i>		
<i>and Stake No.....20</i>	<i>3.0</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>5.0</i>	<i>39.5</i>	<i>0.08</i>	✓
<i>21</i>	<i>3.0</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>5.0</i>	<i>38.8</i>	<i>0.08</i>	✓
<i>22</i>	<i>3.4</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>5.4</i>	<i>42.7</i>	<i>0.09</i>	✓
<i>23</i>	<i>3.5</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>5.5</i>	<i>47.4</i>	<i>0.09</i>	✓
<i>24</i>	<i>2.9</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.9</i>	<i>43.0</i>	<i>0.09</i>	✓
<i>25</i>	<i>3.4</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>5.4</i>	<i>42.9</i>	<i>0.09</i>	✓
<i>26</i>	<i>3.1</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>5.1</i>	<i>43.3</i>	<i>0.09</i>	✓
<i>27</i>	<i>3.0</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>5.0</i>	<i>39.5</i>	<i>0.08</i>	✓
<i>28</i>	<i>2.8</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.8</i>	<i>37.0</i>	<i>0.08</i>	✓
<i>29</i>	<i>2.9</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.9</i>	<i>35.8</i>	<i>0.08</i>	✓
<i>30</i>	<i>2.8</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.8</i>	<i>35.7</i>	<i>0.08</i>	✓
<i>31</i>	<i>2.8</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.8</i>	<i>35.2</i>	<i>0.08</i>	✓
<i>32</i>	<i>2.9</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.9</i>	<i>35.8</i>	<i>0.08</i>	✓
<i>33</i>	<i>2.8</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.8</i>	<i>36.5</i>	<i>0.08</i>	✓
<i>34</i>	<i>2.9</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.9</i>	<i>36.5</i>	<i>0.08</i>	✓
<i>35</i>	<i>2.7</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.7</i>	<i>34.7</i>	<i>0.08</i>	✓
<i>36</i>	<i>2.9</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.9</i>	<i>34.7</i>	<i>0.08</i>	✓
<i>37</i>	<i>3.1</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>5.1</i>	<i>38.3</i>	<i>0.08</i>	✓
<i>38</i>	<i>2.9</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.9</i>	<i>38.3</i>	<i>0.08</i>	✓
				<i>1282.6</i>		
<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.

(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	
					\$	cts.
Between Stake No. 38	2.9	2.0	4.9	1252.6		
and Stake No. 39	3.0	2.1	5.0	37.7	0.08	✓
40	3.0	2.0	5.0	38.8		✓
41	2.9	2.0	4.9	37.7	0.08	✓
42	3.3	2.0	5.3	42.1		✓
43	3.1	2.0	5.1	42.0	0.08	✓
44	3.1	2.0	5.1	40.1	0.08	✓
45	3.1	2.0	5.1	40.1	0.08	✓
46	3.0	2.0	5.0	39.5	0.08	✓
47	3.2	2.0	5.2	40.7	0.08	✓
48	3.1	2.0	5.1	41.0	0.08	✓
49	2.3	2.0	4.3	33.2	0.08	✓
50	3.2			34.5	0.08	✓
51	3.3	2.0	5.3	43.3	0.08	✓
52	3.2	2.0	5.2	43.3	0.09	✓
53	4.0	2.0	6.0	52.5	0.09	✓
54	3.1	2.0		49.7	0.08	✓
55	3.2	2.0	5.2	41.5	0.08	✓
56	3.1	2.0	5.1	41.4		
57	2.5	2.0	4.8	37.7	0.08	✓
				2059.4		
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.....

(4)

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD	
					\$	cts.
Between Stake No.....57	2.5	2.0	4.8	2059.4		
and Stake No.....58	2.9	2.0	4.9	35.8	0.08	✓
59	2.7	2.0	4.7	34.7	0.08	✓
60	2.8	2.0	4.8	34.1	0.08	✓
61	2.9	2.0	4.9	35.7	0.08	✓
62	2.7	2.0	4.7	34.7	0.08	✓
63	2.7	2.0	4.7	33.0	0.08	✓
64	2.9	2.0	4.9	34.7	0.08	✓
65	2.8	2.0	4.8	35.8	0.08	✓
66	2.8	2.0	4.8	35.2	0.08	✓
67	2.8	2.0	4.8	35.2	0.08	✓
68	2.9	2.0	4.9	35.8	0.08	✓
69	2.8	2.0	4.8	35.8	0.08	✓
70	2.3	2.0	4.3	30.8	0.08	✓
71	2.8	2.0	4.8	30.8	0.08	✓
72	2.7	2.0	4.7	30.4	0.08	✓
73	3.0	2.0	5.0	35.9	0.08	✓
74	2.80	2.0	4.8	37.0	0.08	✓
75	2.6	2.0	4.6	33.2	0.08	✓
76	2.8	2.0	4.8	33.2	0.08	✓
				2711.2		
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. (5)

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD		
					\$.	cts.	
Between Stake No.....76.....	2.8	2.0	4.8	2711.2			
and Stake No.....77.....	2.6	2.0	4.6	34.7	0.08	✓	
78	2.7	2.0	4.7	33.5	0.08	✓	
79	2.5	2.0	4.5	31.3	0.08	✓	
80	2.5	2.0	4.5	29.6	0.08	✓	
81	2.5	2.0	4.5	29.6	0.08	✓	
82	2.6	2.0	4.6	30.7	0.08	✓	
83	2.6	2.0	4.6	31.7	0.08	✓	
84	2.5	2.0	4.5	30.7	0.08	✓	
85	2.6	2.0	4.6	31.7	0.08	✓	
86	2.6	2.0	4.6	31.7	0.08	✓	
87	2.6	2.0	4.6	31.7	0.08	✓	
88	2.5	2.0	4.5	30.7	0.08	✓	
89	2.8	2.0	4.8	32.4	0.08	✓	
90	2.7	2.0	4.7	34.1	0.08	✓	
91	2.8	2.0	4.8	34.1	0.08	✓	
92	2.8	2.0	4.8	35.2	0.08	✓	
93	2.2	2.0	4.2	30.2	0.08	✓	
94	3.0	2.0	5.0	32.0	0.08	✓	
95	2.9	2.0	4.9	37.7	0.08	✓	
				3324.5			
						<i>Totals</i>	

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

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD	
					\$	CTS.
Between Stake No..... <i>95</i>	<i>2.9</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.9</i>	<i>3324.5</i>		
and Stake No..... <i>96</i>	<i>2.6</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.6</i>	<i>34.1</i>	<i>0.08</i>	✓
<i>97</i>	<i>2.4</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.4</i>	<i>30.1</i>	<i>0.08</i>	✓
<i>98</i>	<i>3.2</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>5.2</i>	<i>35.5</i>	<i>0.08</i>	✓
<i>99</i>	<i>2.9</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.9</i>	<i>39.4</i>	<i>0.08</i>	✓
<i>100</i>	<i>3.1</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>5.1</i>	<i>38.3</i>	<i>0.09</i>	✓
<i>101</i>	<i>2.9</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.9</i>	<i>38.3</i>	<i>0.09</i>	✓
<i>102</i>	<i>3.4</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>5.4</i>	<i>41.5</i>	<i>0.09</i>	✓
<i>103</i>	<i>3.2</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>5.2</i>	<i>44.6</i>	<i>0.09</i>	✓
<i>104</i>	<i>3.4</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>5.4</i>	<i>44.6</i>	<i>0.09</i>	✓
<i>105</i>	<i>3.1</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>5.1</i>	<i>43.3</i>	<i>0.09</i>	✓
<i>106</i>	<i>3.0</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>5.0</i>	<i>39.5</i>	<i>0.08</i>	✓
<i>107</i>	<i>2.7</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.7</i>	<i>35.9</i>	<i>0.08</i>	✓
<i>108</i>	<i>2.6</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.6</i>	<i>32.3</i>	<i>0.08</i>	✓
<i>109</i>	<i>2.5</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.5</i>	<i>30.7</i>	<i>0.09</i>	✓
<i>110</i>	<i>2.3</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.3</i>	<i>28.0</i>	<i>0.09</i>	✓
<i>111</i>	<i>2.4</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.4</i>	<i>27.4</i>	<i>0.09</i>	✓
<i>112</i>	<i>2.8</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.8</i>	<i>24.7</i>	<i>0.09</i>	✓
<i>113</i>	<i>2.4</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.4</i>	<i>31.8</i>	<i>0.09</i>	✓
<i>114</i>	<i>2.7</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>4.7</i>	<i>30.7</i>	<i>0.09</i>	✓
				<i>3995.2</i>		
<i>Totals</i>						

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

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD	
					\$	Cts.
Between Stake No.....114	2.7	2.0	4.7	3995.2		
and Stake No.....115	1.6	2.0	3.6	24.7	0.09	✓
116	1.7	2.0	3.7	26.2	0.09	✓
117	1.6	2.0	3.6	26.2	0.09	✓
118	1.4	2.0	3.4	15.3	0.09	✓
119	1.1	2.0	3.1	12.0	0.09	✓
120	0.6		2.6	7.6	0.09	✓
121	0.5	2.0	2.5	14.5	0.09	✓
122	0.2	2.0	2.2	2.8	0.09	✓
123				4114.5		
124						
125						
				3256.2 cub. yds @	0.8	\$ 260.49
				858.3 " " "	0.9	\$ 77.25
				4114.5		\$ 337.74
						15 ⁰⁰ culvert on Bridge
						35294
				4114.5		Totals