

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. ....

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. 0	3.2	3.0	7.8			
and Stake No. 1	3.9	"	8.8	76	.08	
2	3.5	"	8.3	78	"	
3	3.6	"	8.4	76	"	
4	3.7	"	8.6	76	"	
5	3.7	"	8.6	77	"	
6	3.8	"	8.7	83	"	
7	3.9	"	8.9	84	"	
8	3.6	"	8.4	81	"	
9	3.7	"	8.6	78	"	
10	3.8	"	8.7	81	"	
				790		
Totals						

From Station 0 to Station 100  
 Stakes stand at Right Edge  
 of ditch looking down  
 stream - dig ditch on left  
 side of stakes

4  
4  
4  
4  
4  
4  
4  
4  
4  
4  
4

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. ....

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. .... 10				Point Form = 790		
and Stake No. .... 11	3.8	3.0	8.7	82	0.8	x
12	3.6	"	8.4	79	"	x
13	3.9	"	8.9	81	"	x
14	3.7	"	8.6	82	"	x
15	3.9	"	8.9	82	"	x
16	3.8	"	8.7	84	"	x
17	3.6	"	8.4	79	"	x
18	3.6	"	8.4	76	"	x
19	3.6	"	8.4	76	"	x
20	3.7	"	8.6	78	"	x
				1589		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. ....

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>20</u>				<u>1589</u>		
and Stake No. <u>21</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>8.4</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>08</u>	✓
<u>22</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>8.4</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>"</u>	4
<u>23</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>8.9</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>"</u>	✓
<u>24</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>8.6</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>"</u>	✓
<u>25</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>9.0</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>"</u>	✓
<u>26</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>8.9</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>"</u>	✓
<u>27</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>8.6</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>"</u>	✓
<u>28</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>8.7</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>"</u>	✓
<u>29</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>8.7</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>"</u>	✓
<u>30</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>8.9</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>"</u>	✓
				<u>240.6</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.*.....

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>Between Stake No. 30</i>				<i>2406</i>	<i>φ</i>	
<i>and Stake No. 31</i>	<i>3.7</i>	<i>3.0</i>	<i>8.6</i>	<i>82</i>	<i>.08</i>	✓
<i>32</i>	<i>4.0</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>9.0</i>	<i>84</i>	<i>"</i>	4
<i>33</i>	<i>3.7</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>8.6</i>	<i>84</i>	<i>"</i>	4
<i>34</i>	<i>3.3</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>8.0</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>"</i>	4
<i>35</i>	<i>0.5</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>3.7</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>"</i>	4
<i>36</i>	<i>0.6</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>3.9</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>"</i>	✓
<i>37</i>	<i>1.6</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>5.4</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>"</i>	4
<i>38</i>	<i>2.6</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>6.3</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>"</i>	4
<i>39</i>	<i>2.6</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>6.3</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>"</i>	4
<i>40</i>	<i>0.7</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>4.1</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>"</i>	4
				<i>2898</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. ....

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>40</u>				<u>2898</u>	<u>φ</u>	
and Stake No. <u>41</u>	<u>0.7</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>08</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>42</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>43</u>	<u>0.8</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>44</u>	<u>0.8</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>45</u>	<u>1.3</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>46</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>47</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>48</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>49</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>50</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.2</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>✓</u>
				<u>3034</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.*.....

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>50</u>				3034		
and Stake No. <u>51</u>	2.3	3.0	6.5	38	08	✓
52	2.6	"	6.9	44	"	4
53	2.2	"	6.3	43	"	4
54	2.7	"	7.1	44	"	4
55	3.2	"	7.8	72	"	x
56	4.6	"	9.9	86	"	4
57	4.8	"	10.2	114	"	4
58	4.8	"	10.2	117	"	4
59	5.1	"	10.8	123	"	4
60	5.6	"	10.5	127	"	4
				3842		7
<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. ....

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>60</u>				3842	¢	
and Stake No. <u>61</u>	4.6	3.0	9.9	117	08	4
<u>62</u>	4.6	"	9.9	110	"	4
<u>63</u>	4.8	"	10.2	114	"	4
<u>64</u>	4.5	"	9.8	112	"	4
<u>65</u>	4.5	"	9.8	106	"	4
<u>66</u>	4.4	"	9.6	105	"	4
<u>67</u>	4.5	"	9.8	105	"	4
<u>68</u>	4.3	"	9.5	103	"	4
<u>69</u>	4.2	"	9.3	97	"	x
<u>70</u>	4.4	"	9.6	99	"	4
				4910		
<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. ....

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>70</u>				4910	6	
and Stake No. <u>1</u>	4.3	3.0	9.5	101	08	
2	4.8	"	10.2	108	"	4
3	4.3	"	9.5	108	"	4
4	4.4	"	9.6	101	"	4
5	4.6	"	9.9	106	"	6
6	4.5	"	9.8	108	"	4
7	4.8	"	10.2	112	"	4
8	5.3	"	11.0	127	"	4
9	4.7	"	10.1	116	"	4
80	4.4	"	9.6	91	"	4
				5988		
<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.....

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>80</u> and Stake No. <u>81</u>	4.6	3.0	9.9	5988 89	\$	08	
82	4.1	"	9.2	84	"		
83	4.6	"	9.9	93	"		
84	3.8	"	8.7	96	"		
85	3.8	"	8.7	82	"		
86	3.7	"	8.6	81	"		
87	3.6	"	8.4	78	"		
88	3.6	"	8.4	76	"		
89	3.4	"	8.1	73	"		
90	3.4	"	8.1	70	"		
				6810			
<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.*.....

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>90</u>				6810		
and Stake No. <u>91</u>	3.6	3.0	8.4	73	08	+
92	4.0	"	9.0	82	"	+
93	3.7	"	8.6	84	"	+
94	3.6	"	8.4	78	"	+
95	3.4	"	8.1	73	"	+
96	3.4	"	8.1	55	"	✓
97	3.3	"	8.0	54	"	4
98	3.4	"	8.1	54	"	+
99	3.2	"	7.8	52	"	4
100	3.3	"	8.0	50	"	+
				7465		
<i>Totals</i>						

Ditch No 2

EXHIBIT I. - 1

## VIEWERS' REPORT

### DITCH PROCEEDINGS.

Highland Ditch  
Main Line  
Sta 0 to Sta 100  
work to be fully  
Completed by  
October 1<sup>st</sup> 1889

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

No Earth thrown  
out of ditch to be  
left nearer than  
2 feet from Edge

Total = 17,396 yds  
Cost = \$1391.68 for  
main line

Branch = 2284 yds  
Cost = \$182.72

Filed December 26<sup>th</sup> 1888.  
G. M. Putnam  
Co. Auditor