

Hearing on Engineer's and Viewers' Reports - Aug. 22, 1949

Mr. Cutter: Do you consider the repair and modification feasible, necessary, beneficial and that the outlet is adequate?

J. George Dean: Yes

Robert Johnson: It does not satisfy all the requirements as set out in the statutes for the reason that ~~the amount of money involved is not~~ it is not of public benefit and that the amount of money involved is not justified.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Gamm your primary objection is that you would not receive benefits equal to what you would be assessed.

F. J. Gamm: I would not get much benefit out of it.

Q. You do not believe your land would be worth that much if it were drained?

A. No. I cannot see that much benefit.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Moos you were one of the original petitioners and I understand you now want your name withdrawn?

John Moos: Yes. It will cost too much money.

Q. You do not feel your land would be benefited that much.

A. No. It is useless now.

Q. If you could use it you do not believe it would be worth \$600.00

A. No.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Perkins you also object.

Chas. L. Perkins: Yes on the grounds that it will cost too much.

Q. You do not feel that you would be benefited?

A. I do not.

Q. You definitely object.

A. Absolutely. We think it is too much.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Harrington you object to this petition?

A. The land that it will benefit is in the corner and would ~~do~~ not do any good.

Q. You do not feel you would get any benefits?

A. No, it is up in the corner and would do not good. It would be better to leave as is and what little I would get out of it, I would not get that much benefit. Leaving the water there would do me more good in case of dry years.

Mr. Johnson: Mrs. Conroy, I understand that you object.

A. I do object and my husband objected when they came around with the petition. It is too expensive.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Kennedy, you object?

A. It makes no difference to me. I am not against it or for it. I would sooner that it not be drained. My land would not be benefited.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Gay you object to this ditch?

A. Yes, my land would not be benefited that much.

Q. You have one fifteen and one 20 acre tract?

A. Yes. There is not that much of my land that has to be drained. I have, I believe half that much. I am against it.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Rootes, you object on the same grounds?

Lester Rootes: Yes. Too much cost per acre. My land is all drained. Cost as a whole is too great for benefits of public.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Kohler, will you tell the Commissioners why you object.

Ernest Kohler: It is too much money.

Q. You do not feel you would get the amount you are assessed for out of the land.

A. No.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Koehler, will you tell the Commissioners what your objection is to this ditch.

Paul Koehler: It is too high. We are willing to pay for an outlet but not at that price. We would not get any benefits.

Q. The present cleaning would do you no good.

A. Not a bit.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Olson, will you tell the Commissioners what your objections are.

Elmer Olson: It is a lot of money for a ditch. I do not see why it should cost that much. I do not see that I would get that much benefit.

Q. You definitely do not feel that you would get anything out of this.

A. No.

_____, present owner of Becker property.

I do not see why I would be assessed that much. I could use it as it is. I cannot see that it would give me a bit of benefit. Not for the amount assessed.

Mr. Johnson: Do you receive any benefits?

Chas. Burley: Not any. I have been there for 16 years and have always been able to use it. I would receive no benefits.

Mr. Johnson: Are you going to gain any benefits?

Mr. S.(?) Not any. I cannot see that I would be benefited at all. My land is too dry now/

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Hanson, will you tell the Commissioners why you object.

Mr. Hanson: It is too expensive. I would not receive any benefits.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Campbell, you are assessed for thirteen acres. What is your objection?

Mr. Campbell: The entire cost of the ditch is too much. I have only about three acres that would be benefited. We would have to spend a lot of money if it were drained to get the land to raise anything.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Johnson, you have two different pieces of land. Do you object?

Alfred Johnson: I have farmed this same piece for thirty years for hay and pasture. I do not feel that I would be benefited.

Mr. Johnson: Mrs. Hovind, why do you object?

Mrs. Hovind: Primarily, the cost. We have been there two years and it has always been dry. The cost is excessive.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Riley, you have ten acres. Do you wish to tell the Commissioners your objection?

Mr. Riley: If they can tell me how I can make \$300.00 on that land, I will be in favor of the ditch. I have been using it for nineteen years. I do not want it drained. I use part of it for hay and part for pasture. If it were drained it would lessen the amount of hay and pasture land. If ditch were dug and slough dried up I would lose money. I use the slough to water the cattle. With the increased assessed valuation and interest on the assessment, I would lose money.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Loucks, I believe you have a letter on file objecting to the ditch.

Mr. J. Loucks: I believe I would have to put an amount equal to the assessment into the land before I could use it. My chief objection is the cost. Land would not be benefited to that extent. I am also representing Luther, Frank and Raymond Loucks.

James Keillor: It would be artificial drainage and would flood my land rather than drain it. The land that would be drained is my best pasture now. If I felt that it would help my neighbors I would be in favor of it, but I feel that the cost is excessive.

Elmer Moos: I do not object.

R. W. Hunt: I am in favor of the ditch.

Renter of Alfred Wickstrom property: I am in favor of ditch.

E. Perret: I am in favor of ditch.