
VIEWERS' REPORT

FILED IN
NO. 11717
MAY 17 1895

DITCH PROCEEDINGS.

Ditch 25
Main Line

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

Filed April 6th 1895
J. 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. 25 Main Line

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS to be REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD		
					\$	Cts	
Between Stake No. <u>0</u>	<u>1.4</u>	<u>2 feet</u>	<u>3.4</u>				
and Stake No. <u>1</u>	<u>1.6</u>	"	<u>3.6</u>	<u>15</u>		<u>7</u>	✓
<u>2</u>	<u>1.7</u>	"	<u>3.7</u>	<u>17</u>		<u>7</u>	✓
<u>3</u>	<u>2.0</u>	"	<u>4.0</u>	<u>20</u>		<u>7</u>	✓
<u>4</u>	<u>1.7</u>	"	<u>3.7</u>	<u>20</u>		<u>7</u>	✓
<u>5</u>	<u>1.8</u>	"	<u>3.8</u>	<u>19</u>		<u>7</u>	✓
<u>6</u>	<u>1.7</u>	"	<u>3.7</u>	<u>19</u>		<u>7</u>	✓
<u>7</u>	<u>2.0</u>	"	<u>4.0</u>	<u>8</u>		<u>7</u>	✓
<u>8</u>	<u>1.9</u>	"	<u>3.9</u>	<u>9</u>		<u>7</u>	✓
<u>9</u>	<u>1.9</u>	"	<u>3.9</u>	<u>10</u>		<u>7</u>	✓
<u>10</u>	<u>2.1</u>	"	<u>4.1</u>	<u>9</u>		<u>7</u>	✓
<u>11</u>	<u>2.3</u>	"	<u>4.3</u>	<u>10</u>		<u>7</u>	✓
<u>12</u>	<u>2.3</u>	"	<u>4.3</u>	<u>11</u>		<u>7</u>	✓
<u>13</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>4.2</u>	<u>13</u>		<u>7</u>	✓
<u>14</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>4.2</u>	<u>14</u>		<u>7</u>	✓
<u>15</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>4.2</u>	<u>16</u>		<u>7</u>	✓
<u>16</u>	<u>2.3</u>	"	<u>4.3</u>	<u>18</u>		<u>7</u>	✓
<u>17</u>	<u>2.1</u>	"	<u>4.1</u>	<u>22</u>		<u>7</u>	✓
<u>18</u>	<u>2.0</u>	"	<u>4.0</u>	<u>23</u>		<u>7</u>	✓
<u>19</u>	<u>1.9</u>	"	<u>3.9</u>	<u>22</u>		<u>7</u>	✓
				<u>295</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. 25

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS <i>to be</i> REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD		
Between Stake No. 20	1.7	2 feet	3.7	19	8	7	✓
and Stake No. 21	2.1	"	4.1	21	8	7	✓
22	2.0	"	4.0	23	8	7	✓
23	1.8	"	3.8	21	8	7	✓
24	2.4	"	4.4	25	8	7	✓
25	2.3	"	4.3	28	8	7	✓
26	2.3	"	4.3	27	8	7	✓
27	2.3	"	4.3	27	8	7	✓
28	2.4	"	4.4	28	8	7	✓
29	2.2	"	4.2	27	8	7	✓
30	2.7	"	4.7	29	8	7	✓
31	1.4	"	3.4	23	8	7	✓
32	1.5	"	3.5	15	8	7	✓
33	1.7	"	3.7	17	8	7	✓
34	2.0	"	4.0	20	8	7	✓
35	1.9	"	3.9	22	8	7	✓
36	1.9	"	3.9	21	8	7	✓
37	1.9	"	3.9	21	8	7	✓
38	1.7	"	3.7	19	8	7	✓
39	1.9	"	3.9	19	8	7	✓
				747			
							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. 25

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS TO BE REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD	
Between Stake No. <u>40</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>W. of cut</u>	<u>4.4</u>	<u>747</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>¢</u>
and Stake No. <u>41</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>42</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>43</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>44</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>45</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>46</u>	<u>1.4</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>47</u>	<u>1.4</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>48</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>49</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>4.4</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>50</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>4.8</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>51</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>52</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>53</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>54</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>55</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>56</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>57</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>58</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>59</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>✓</u>
				<u>1196</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. 25

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS TO BE REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD	
Between Stake No. 60	2.2	2 feet	6.4	11196 25	\$ 7	✓
and Stake No. 61	2.3	"	6.6	31	7	✓
62	3.2	"	8.4	48	7	✓
63	4.8	"	11.6	89	7	✓
64	3.2	"	8.4	89	7	✓
65	3.1	"	8.2	60	7	✓
66	2.8	"	7.6	54	7	✓
67	2.6	"	7.2	47	7	✓
68	2.7	"	7.4	46	7	✓
69	2.8	"	7.6	48	7	✓
70	2.9	"	7.8	51	7	✓
71	2.7	"	7.4	50	7	✓
72	2.9	"	7.8	50	7	✓
73	2.6	"	7.2	48	7	✓
74	2.5	"	7.0	43	7	✓
75	2.9	"	7.8	47	7	✓
76	2.4	"	6.8	46	7	✓
77	2.0	"	6.0	34	7	✓
78	2.5	"	7.0	28	7	✓
79	2.5	"	7.0	36		
				2166		
						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. 25

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS		ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD	
				<i>to be</i>	REMOVED	\$	¢
Between Stake No. <u>80</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>2 feet</u>	<u>7.2</u>		<u>38</u>		<u>7</u> ✓
and Stake No. <u>81</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>7.6</u>		<u>40</u>		<u>7</u> ✓
<u>82</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.4</u>		<u>32</u>		<u>7</u> ✓
<u>83</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.6</u>		<u>23</u>		<u>7</u> ✓
<u>84</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.6</u>		<u>23</u>		<u>7</u> ✓
<u>85</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.2</u>		<u>22</u>		<u>7</u> ✓
<u>86</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>5.8</u>		<u>19</u>		<u>7</u> ✓
<u>87</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>7.0</u>		<u>22</u>		<u>7</u> ✓
<u>88</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.0</u>		<u>25</u>		<u>7</u> ✓
<u>89</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>7.0</u>		<u>26</u>		<u>7</u> ✓
<u>90</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.6</u>		<u>28</u>		<u>7</u> ✓
<u>91</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.2</u>		<u>25</u>		<u>7</u> ✓
<u>92</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>5.8</u>		<u>22</u>		<u>7</u> ✓
<u>93</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>5.4</u>		<u>16</u>		<u>7</u> ✓
<u>94</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.8</u>		<u>21</u>		<u>7</u> ✓
<u>95</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.4</u>		<u>27</u>		<u>7</u> ✓
<u>96</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.6</u>		<u>24</u>		<u>7</u> ✓
<u>97</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>7.0</u>		<u>28</u>		<u>7</u> ✓
<u>98</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.8</u>		<u>29</u>		<u>7</u> ✓
<u>99</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.4</u>		<u>26</u>		<u>7</u> ✓
					<u>2682</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. 25

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>to be</i>	\$	¢
Between Stake No. <u>100</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>2 feet</u>	<u>6.8</u>	<u>23</u>		7 ✓
and Stake No. <u>101</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>7.0</u>	<u>26</u>		7 ✓
<u>102</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>7.0</u>	<u>28</u>		7 ✓
<u>103</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>7.2</u>	<u>30</u>		7 ✓
<u>104</u>	<u>2.1</u>	"	<u>6.2</u>	<u>27</u>		7 ✓
<u>105</u>	<u>2.0</u>	"	<u>6.0</u>	<u>16</u>		7 ✓
<u>106</u>	<u>2.1</u>	"	<u>6.2</u>	<u>17</u>		7 ✓
<u>107</u>	<u>2.1</u>	"	<u>6.2</u>	<u>18</u>		7 ✓
<u>108</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>7.0</u>	<u>20</u>		7 ✓
<u>109</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>7.6</u>	<u>23</u>		7 ✓
<u>110</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>7.0</u>	<u>19</u>		7 ✓
<u>111</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>7.0</u>	<u>14</u>		7 ✓
<u>112</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>6.4</u>	<u>15</u>		7 ✓
<u>113</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>6.4</u>	<u>14</u>		7 ✓
<u>114</u>	<u>2.4</u>	"	<u>6.8</u>	<u>19</u>		7 ✓
<u>115</u>	<u>3.9</u>	"	<u>9.8</u>	<u>30</u>		7 ✓
<u>116</u>	<u>2.3</u>	"	<u>6.6</u>	<u>24</u>		7 ✓
<u>117</u>	<u>2.7</u>	"	<u>7.4</u>	<u>25</u>		7 ✓
<u>118</u>	<u>2.3</u>	"	<u>6.6</u>	<u>32</u>		7 ✓
<u>119</u>	<u>2.9</u>	"	<u>7.8</u>	<u>25</u>		7 ✓
				<u>3122</u>		
						<i>Totals</i>

EXHIBIT I OF VIEWERS' REPORT IN DITCH PROCEEDINGS, Showing Estimated Depth of Cut, Width, No. of Cubic Yards Removed and Cost of same, in Ditch No. 25

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS <i>to be</i> REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD	
Between Stake No. <u>120</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>2 fut</u>	<u>6.6</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
and Stake No. <u>121</u>	<u>2.4</u>	"	<u>6.8</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>122</u>	<u>2.1</u>	"	<u>6.2</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>123</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>7.2</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>124</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>7.2</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>125</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>7.0</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>126</u>	<u>2.3</u>	"	<u>6.6</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>127</u>	<u>2.3</u>	"	<u>6.6</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>128</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>7.0</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>129</u>	<u>2.0</u>	"	<u>6.0</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>130</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>7.2</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>131</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>7.2</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>132</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>7.0</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>133</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>7.2</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>134</u>	<u>2.4</u>	"	<u>6.8</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>135</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>6.4</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>136</u>	<u>2.1</u>	"	<u>6.2</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>137</u>	<u>2.1</u>	"	<u>6.2</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>138</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>6.4</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>139</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>6.4</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
				<u>3772</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. 25

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS TO BE REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD	
Between Stake No. <u>140</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>2 feet</u>	<u>6.4</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
and Stake No. <u>141</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.4</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>142</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>143</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>144</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>145</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>146</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>147</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>3 feet</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>148</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>8.4</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>149</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>8.6</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>150</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>151</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.4</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>152</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.6</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>153</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.2</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>154</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>7.0</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>155</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>7.0</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>156</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>157</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.4</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>158</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.6</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
<u>159</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>6.4</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>7</u>	✓
				<u>424</u>		
				<u>5</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. 25

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. 160	1.9	3 feet	6.8	42.42	7	✓
and Stake No. 161	1.7	"	6.4	21	7	✓
162	1.7	"	6.4	20	7	✓
163	1.6	"	6.2	18	7	✓
164	2.4	"	7.8	17	7	✓
165	1.6	"	6.2	20	7	✓
166	1.2	"	5.4	5.2	7	✓
+ 37	0.1	"	0 "	23	7	✓
				3	7	✓
				4416		
<i>Estimate</i>						
Yds Excavation Main Line				= 4416	@ 7 = 309.12	
" " Branch "				= 3838	" 7 = 268.66	
Bridge at Sta 62				=	12.00	
" " " 115 Main "				=	00.00	
" " " 164+50 "				=	12.00	
Locating Expenses					124.50	
Auditors Fees					25.00	
Shiriff					9.00	
Printer					20.00	
Register					2.00	
E. Picard					5.00	
					<u>787.28</u>	
						Totals