

Ditch No. 22

EXHIBIT I.

VIEWERS' REPORT

—IN—

DITCH PROCEEDINGS.

Ditch No 22

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

Filed December 23 1893

*J. 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. 22

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD	
					\$	Cents
Between Stake No. <u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0 0</u>	<u>0 0</u>	<u>0 0</u>	\$	Cents
and Stake No. <u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0 0</u>	<u>0 0</u>	<u>0 0</u>		
<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0 0</u>	<u>0 0</u>	<u>0 0</u>		
<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0 0</u>	<u>0 0</u>	<u>0 0</u>		
<u>4</u>	<u>1.2</u>	<u>2 0</u>	<u>4 4</u>	<u>0 0</u>		
<u>5</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>2 0</u>	<u>5 2</u>	<u>18</u>		
<u>6</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>2 0</u>	<u>5 0</u>	<u>2 0</u>		
<u>7</u>	<u>1.2</u>	<u>2 0</u>	<u>4 4</u>	<u>1 6</u>		
<u>8</u>	<u>1.2</u>	<u>2 0</u>	<u>4 4</u>	<u>1 4</u>		
<u>9</u>	<u>1.3</u>	<u>2 0</u>	<u>4 6</u>	<u>1 5</u>		
<u>10</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>2 0</u>	<u>5 6</u>	<u>2 0</u>		
<u>11</u>	<u>1.1</u>	<u>2 0</u>	<u>4 1</u>	<u>1 8</u>		
<u>12</u>	<u>1.3</u>	<u>2 0</u>	<u>4 6</u>	<u>1 4</u>		
<u>13</u>	<u>1.1</u>	<u>2 0</u>	<u>4 2</u>	<u>1 4</u>		
<u>14</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>2 0</u>	<u>5 2</u>	<u>1 6</u>		
<u>15</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>2 0</u>	<u>5 4</u>	<u>2 2</u>		
<u>16</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>2 0</u>	<u>5 6</u>	<u>2 4</u>		
<u>17</u>	<u>1.2</u>	<u>2 0</u>	<u>4 4</u>	<u>1 9</u>		
<u>18</u>	<u>1.2</u>	<u>2 0</u>	<u>4 4</u>	<u>1 4</u>		
<u>19</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>2 0</u>	<u>5 4</u>	<u>1 8</u>		
				<u>2 6 3</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. 22

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD	
					\$	Cents
Between Stake No. 21	2.5	2.11 ft	7.0	31	8	✓
and Stake No. 21	2.3	" "	6.6	39	8	✓
22	1.9	" "	5.8	31	8	✓
23	2.2	" "	6.4	32	8	✓
24	1.9	" "	5.8	32	8	✓
25	1.3	" "	4.6	21	8	✓
26	1.4	" "	4.8	16	8	✓
27	1.5	" "	5.11	18	8	✓
28	1.5	" "	5.11	19	8	✓
29	1.4	" "	4.8	18	8	✓
30	1.8	" "	5.6	21	8	✓
31	1.9	" "	5.8	26	8	✓
32	1.8	" "	5.6	26	8	✓
33	1.7	" "	5.4	24	8	✓
34	1.8	" "	5.6	24	8	✓
35	1.8	" "	5.6	25	8	✓
36	2.7	" "	7.4	31	8	✓
37	3.1	" "	8.2	45	8	✓
38	3.2	" "	8.4	51	8	✓
39	3.7	" "	9.4	60	8	✓
Carried forward				852		
				68		
<i>Totals</i>						

EXHIBIT 1 OF VIEWERS' REPORT IN DITCH PROCEEDINGS, Showing Estimated Depth of Cut, Width, No. of Cubic Yards Removed and
 3 Cost of same, in Ditch No. 22

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD		
					\$	Cents	
Between Stake No. 41	4.6	2.0 ft	11.2	852		8	✓
and Stake No. 41	3.9	" "	9.8	84		8	✓
42	1.7	" "	5.4	85		8	✓
43	1.3	" "	4.6	43		8	✓
44	1.2	" "	4.4	19		8	✓
45	1.1	" "	4.2	15		8	✓
46	1.1	" "	4.2	13		8	✓
47	1.9	" "	3.8	11		8	✓
48	1.8	" "	3.6	9		8	✓
49	1.9	" "	3.8	9		8	✓
50	1.9	" "	3.8	10		8	✓
51	1.9	" "	3.8	10		8	✓
52	1.8	" "	3.6	9		8	✓
53	1.2	" "	4.4	11		8	✓
54	1.2	" "	4.4	14		8	✓
55	0.8	" "	3.6	11		8	✓
56	1.9	" "	3.8	9		8	✓
57	1.4	" "	4.8	14		8	✓
58	1.7	" "	5.4	20		8	✓
59	1.1	" "	4.2	18		8	✓
	1.8	" "	5.6	18		8	✓
			Carried forward	1284			
Totals							

EXHIBIT 1 OF VIEWERS' REPORT IN DITCH PROCEEDINGS, Showing Estimated Depth of Cut, Width, No. of Cubic Yards Removed and
 4 Cost of same, in Ditch No. 22

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD	Cent
Between Stake No. 60	1.9	2.0 feet	5.8	Butford 1284		8
and Stake No. 61	1.7	" "	5.4	26		8
62	1.9	" "	5.8	25		8
63	1.9	" "	5.8	27		8
64	1.8	" "	5.6	26		8
65	1.8	" "	5.6	25		8
66	1.9	" "	5.8	26		8
67	2.4	" "	6.8	35		8
68	2.5	" "	7.4	40		8
69	2.9	" "	7.8	47		8
70	2.3	" "	6.6	44		8
71	2.2	" "	6.4	35		8
72	1.6	" "	5.2	27		8
73	1.7	" "	5.4	22		8
74	1.2	" "	4.4	18		8
75	0.8	" "	3.6	11		8
76	1.7	" "	5.4	15		8
77	1.8	" "	3.6	15		8
78	1.4	" "	4.8	13		8
79	1.3	" "	4.6	16		8
			Carroll fork	1802		
<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. 22

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	
Between Stake No. <u>80</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>2.0 ft</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>But find 1802</u> <u>18</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
and Stake No. <u>81</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>6.2</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>82</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>5.2</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>83</u>	<u>1.2</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>4.4</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>84</u>	<u>1.4</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>4.8</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>85</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>5.4</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>86</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>87</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>5.6</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>88</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>5.6</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>89</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>5.6</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>90</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>6.4</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>91</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>3.0 "</u>	<u>6.2</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>92</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>6.8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>93</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>3.0 "</u>	<u>6.8</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>94</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>7.1</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>95</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>3.0 "</u>	<u>7.4</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>96</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>7.4</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>97</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>3.0 "</u>	<u>7.4</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>98</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>9.4</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>99</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>3.0 "</u>	<u>7.2</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
				<u>Carried forward 2211</u> <u>49</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. 22

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>110</u>	2.0	3 ft	7.0	<i>But find</i> 2211	8	✓
and Stake No. <u>111</u>	3.1	" "	9.2	16	8	✓
<u>112</u>	2.3	" "	7.6	32	8	✓
<u>113</u>	2.2	" "	7.4	35	8	✓
<u>114</u> <i>Bridge</i>	2.0	" "	7.0	22	8	✓
<u>115</u> <i>on to road</i>	2.4	" "	7.8	19	8	✓
<u>116</u>	1.9	" "	6.8	21	8	✓
<u>117</u>	1.9	" "	6.8	20	8	✓
<u>118</u>	2.4	" "	7.8	14	8	✓
<u>119</u>	3.2	" "	9.4	20	8	✓
<u>120</u>	2.1	" "	7.2	39	8	✓
<u>121</u>	2.2	" "	7.4	36	8	✓
<u>122</u>	2.2	" "	7.4	21	8	✓
<u>123</u>	2.1	" "	7.4	22	8	✓
<u>124</u>	2.1	" "	7.2	21	8	✓
<u>125</u>	2.3	" "	7.6	20	8	✓
<u>126</u>	2.5	" "	8.0	22	8	✓
<u>127</u>	2.3	" "	7.6	28	8	✓
<u>128</u>	2.5	" "	8.0	28	8	✓
<u>129</u>	2.6	" "	8.2	28	8	✓
			<i>Conind find</i>	2702		
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. 22

7

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>120</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>3 ft</u>	<u>8.8</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
and Stake No. <u>121</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>8.2</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>122</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>7.8</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>123</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>7.8</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>124</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>7.8</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>125</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>8.8</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>126</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>11.4</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>127</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>8.6</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>128</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>8.2</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>129</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>8.2</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>130</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>7.8</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>131</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>8.2</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>132</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>8.8</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>133</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>8.6</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>134</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>7.6</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>135</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>7.4</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>136</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>7.8</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>137</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>8.2</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>138</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>7.8</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
<u>139</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>" "</u>	<u>8.4</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>8</u> ✓
			<u>Carried For</u>	<u>3192</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. 22

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. 140	2.7	3 ft	8.4	But find 3192	8	Estimate of Cost of Ditch No 22 3397 yds of excavation @ \$271.76 = 271,76 Building bridge at No 20 to 21 6,000 Locating Expenses 134.20 Accidents fur. 25.00 Shutoffs " " 9.00 Pruning " " 20.00 Repairs " " 2.00 Total = \$467.96
and Stake No. 141	2.8	" "	8.6	30	8	
142	2.6	" "	8.2	29	8	
143	2.5	" "	8.0	26	8	
144	3.4	" "	9.8	24	8	
145	2.7	" "	8.4	35	8	
+ 70	3.9	" "	10.8	31	8	
			Total	3397		

Totals