
VIEWERS' REPORT

—IN—

DITCH PROCEEDINGS.

Ditch 31

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

*Office of County Auditor
County of Anoka, Minn.
Filed April 30th 1898.
G. B. Pulnam
Co. Auditor
Co.*

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. 31 Main Line - North

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>3.0</u>	<u>2 ft</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>40</u> ✓	<u>All Six (6) Cents per yd</u>
and Stake No. <u>1</u>	<u>2.8</u>		<u>4.8</u>	<u>37</u> ✓	
<u>2</u>	<u>2.9</u>	"	<u>4.9</u>	<u>36</u> ✓	
<u>3</u>	<u>3.4</u>	"	<u>5.2</u>	<u>38</u> ✓	
<u>4</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>4.8</u>	<u>37</u> ✓	
<u>5</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>4.5</u>	<u>33</u> ✓	
<u>6</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>4.5</u>	<u>30</u> ✓	
<u>7</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>4.5</u>	<u>30</u> ✓	
<u>8</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>4.5</u>	<u>30</u> ✓	
<u>9</u>	<u>2.4</u>	"	<u>4.4</u>	<u>29</u> ✓	
<u>0</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>4.5</u>	<u>29</u> ✓	
<u>1</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>4.5</u>	<u>30</u> ✓	
<u>2</u>	<u>2.4</u>	"	<u>4.4</u>	<u>29</u> ✓	
<u>3</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>4.6</u>	<u>30</u> ✓	
<u>4</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>4.8</u>	<u>33</u> ✓	
<u>5</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>4.8</u>	<u>35</u> ✓	
<u>6</u>	<u>2.7</u>	"	<u>4.7</u>	<u>34</u> ✓	
<u>7</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>4.8</u>	<u>34</u> ✓	
<u>8</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>4.8</u>	<u>35</u> ✓	
<u>9</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>4.8</u>	<u>35</u> ✓	
				<u>664</u>	
				<u>8</u>	
					<u>Totals</u>

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. 31 Main Line north

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>2.8</u>	<u>2 ft</u>	<u>4.8</u>	<u>35</u> ✓	<u>All paid by Auto. payor.</u>
and Stake No. <u>1</u>	<u>2.4</u>		<u>4.4</u>	<u>31</u> ✓	
<u>2</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>4.6</u>	<u>30</u> ✓	
<u>3</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>4.6</u>	<u>31</u> ✓	
<u>4</u>	<u>2.4</u>	"	<u>4.4</u>	<u>30</u> ✓	
<u>5</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>4.6</u>	<u>30</u> ✓	
<u>6</u>	<u>2.9</u>	"	<u>4.9</u>	<u>34</u> ✓	
<u>7</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>4.6</u>	<u>34</u> ✓	
<u>8</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>4.8</u>	<u>33</u> ✓	
<u>9</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>4.6</u>	<u>33</u> ✓	
<u>50</u>	<u>2.9</u>	"	<u>4.9</u>	<u>34</u> ✓	
<u>1</u>	<u>2.7</u>	"	<u>4.7</u>	<u>35</u> ✓	
<u>2</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>4.6</u>	<u>33</u> ✓	
<u>3</u>	<u>2.9</u>	"	<u>4.9</u>	<u>34</u> ✓	
<u>4</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>4.8</u>	<u>36</u> ✓	
<u>5</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>4.8</u>	<u>35</u> ✓	
<u>6</u>	<u>2.7</u>	"	<u>4.7</u>	<u>34</u> ✓	
<u>7</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>4.8</u>	<u>34</u> ✓	
<u>8</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>4.8</u>	<u>35</u> ✓	
<u>9</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>4.8</u>	<u>35</u> ✓	
				<u>666</u>	
				<u>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. 31 Main Line North

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>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>2 ft</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>33</u> ✓	
and Stake No. <u>1</u>	<u>2.4</u>		<u>4.4</u>	<u>29</u> ✓	
<u>2</u>	<u>2.7</u>	"	<u>4.7</u>	<u>31</u> ✓	<u>60 to 70</u>
<u>3</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>4.6</u>	<u>33</u> ✓	
<u>4</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>4.8</u>	<u>34</u> ✓	
<u>5</u>	<u>2.9</u>	"	<u>4.9</u>	<u>36</u> ✓	
<u>6</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>4.6</u>	<u>34</u> ✓	
<u>7</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>4.8</u>	<u>33</u> ✓	
<u>8</u>	<u>3.1</u>	"	<u>5.1</u>	<u>38</u> ✓	
<u>9</u>	<u>3.1</u>	"	<u>5.1</u>	<u>41</u> ✓	
<u>70</u>	<u>3.0</u>	"	<u>5.0</u>	<u>40</u> ✓	
<u>1</u>	<u>3.0</u>	"	<u>5.0</u>	<u>39</u> ✓	
<u>2</u>	<u>2.7</u>	"	<u>4.7</u>	<u>36</u> ✓	<u>70 to 79 @</u>
<u>3</u>	<u>3.0</u>	"	<u>5.0</u>	<u>36</u> ✓	
<u>4</u>	<u>2.9</u>	"	<u>4.9</u>	<u>38</u> ✓	
<u>5</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>4.5</u>	<u>33</u> ✓	
<u>6</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>4.2</u>	<u>28</u> ✓	
<u>7</u>	<u>2.3</u>	"	<u>4.3</u>	<u>26</u> ✓	
<u>8</u>	<u>2.0</u>	"	<u>4.0</u>	<u>24</u> ✓	
<u>9</u>	<u>1.7</u>	"	<u>3.7</u>	<u>20</u> ✓	
				<u>320</u>	

41 ✓
40 ✓ = 342

60 to 70
70 to 79 @
Eight (8) Cords per yd
Six Cords per yd

- Damages from -70 to 79 -

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. 31 Main Line - north -

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. 80	1.5	2 ft	3.5	17 ✓	All @ \$16 / Cubic yard
and Stake No. 1	1.8		3.8	17 ✓	
2	1.3	"	3.3	16 ✓	
3	2.1		4.1	18 ✓	
4	2.3	"	4.3	25 ✓	
5	2.1		4.1	25 ✓	
6	2.0	"	4.0	23 ✓	
7	2.5		4.5	26 ✓	
8	2.0	"	4.0	26 ✓	
9	1.4		3.4	18 ✓	
9 0	1.8	"	3.8	17 ✓	
1	2.8		4.8	27 ✓	
2	2.8	"	4.8	35 ✓	
3	2.5		4.5	33 ✓	
4	2.0	"	4.0	26 ✓	
5	2.8		4.8	28 ✓	
6	2.3	"	4.3	48 ✓	
7	2.4		4.4	28 ✓	
8	2.1	"	4.1	26 ✓	
9	2.4		4.4	26 ✓	
				503 12	
<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. 31 Main Low-North

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>100</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>2 ft</u>	<u>4.4</u>	<u>28</u> ✓	<u>Call five (6) cents per yd</u>
and Stake No. <u>1</u>	<u>2.5</u>		<u>4.5</u>	<u>29</u> ✓	
<u>to here</u> <u>2</u>	<u>2.3</u>	"	<u>4.3</u>	<u>28</u> ✓	
<u>3</u>	<u>2.3</u>	"	<u>4.3</u>	<u>27</u> ✓	
<u>4</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>4.6</u>	<u>29</u> ✓	
<u>5</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>4.5</u>	<u>31</u> ✓	
<u>6</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>4.5</u>	<u>30</u> ✓	
<u>7</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>4.6</u>	<u>31</u> ✓	
<u>8</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>4.6</u>	<u>32</u> ✓	
<u>9</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>4.8</u>	<u>33</u> ✓	
<u>110</u>	<u>2.7</u>	"	<u>4.7</u>	<u>34</u> ✓	
<u>11</u>	<u>2.7</u>	"	<u>4.7</u>	<u>33</u> ✓	
<u>12</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>4.5</u>	<u>32</u> ✓	
<u>13</u>	<u>3.0</u>	"	<u>5.0</u>	<u>34</u> ✓	
<u>14</u>	<u>2.7</u>	"	<u>4.7</u>	<u>36</u> ✓	
<u>15</u>	<u>2.1</u>	"	<u>4.1</u>	<u>28</u> ✓	
<u>16</u>	<u>3.1</u>	"	<u>5.1</u>	<u>32</u> ✓	
<u>17</u>	<u>2.7</u>	"	<u>4.7</u>	<u>37</u> ✓	
<u>18</u>	<u>2.7</u>	"	<u>4.7</u>	<u>33</u> ✓	
<u>19</u>	<u>3.2</u>	"	<u>5.2</u>	<u>38</u> ✓	
				<u>635</u>	
				<u>9</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. 31 *Manure North*

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>	2.7	<u>2 1/4</u>	4.7	38 ✓	<i>All dirt (6) cut off in yr</i>
and Stake No. <u>1</u>	2.7		4.7	33 ✓	
<u>2</u>	2.6	"	4.6	33 ✓	
<u>3</u>	2.6	"	4.6	32 ✓	
<u>4</u>	3.2	"	5.2	35 ✓	
<u>5</u>	2.9	"	4.9	40 ✓	
<u>6</u>	2.4	"	4.4	33 ✓	
<u>7</u>	2.6	"	4.6	30 ✓	
<u>8</u>	3.2	"	5.2	37 ✓	
<u>9</u>	2.1	"	4.1	33 ✓	
<u>130</u>	2.2	"	4.2	24 ✓	
<u>1</u>	2.6	"	4.6	28 ✓	
<u>2</u>	2.3	"	4.3	29 ✓	
<u>3</u>	2.3	"	4.3	27 ✓	
<u>4</u>	2.7	"	4.7	30 ✓	
<u>5</u>	2.4	"	4.4	31 ✓	
<u>6</u>	2.4	"	4.4	28 ✓	
<u>7</u>	2.2	"	4.2	27 ✓	
<u>8</u>	2.4	"	4.4	27 ✓	
<u>9</u>	2.7	"	4.7	31 ✓	
				626	
<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. 31 Main Line - north

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>140</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>2 ft</u>	<u>5.7</u>	<u>37</u> ✓	<u>All Exc (6) Auto digger</u>
and Stake No. <u>1</u>	<u>3.2</u>		<u>5.2</u>	<u>42</u> ✓	
<u>2</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>4.8</u>	<u>39</u> ✓	
<u>3</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>4.2</u>	<u>20</u> ✓	
<u>4</u>	<u>1.6</u>	"	<u>3.6</u>	<u>10</u> ✓	
<u>5</u>	<u>2.1</u>	"	<u>4.1</u>	<u>10</u> ✓	
<u>6</u>	<u>2.1</u>	"	<u>4.1</u>	<u>13</u> ✓	
<u>7</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>4.2</u>	<u>13</u> ✓	
<u>8</u>	<u>1.9</u>	"	<u>3.9</u>	<u>12</u> ✓	
<u>9</u>	<u>1.9</u>	"	<u>3.9</u>	<u>10</u> ✓	
<u>150</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>4.2</u>	<u>10</u> ✓	
<u>1</u>	<u>3.1</u>	"	<u>5.1</u>	<u>20</u> ✓	
<u>2</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>4.6</u>	<u>32</u> ✓	
<u>3</u>	<u>3.2</u>	"	<u>5.2</u>	<u>37</u> ✓	
<u>4</u>	<u>2.4</u>	"	<u>4.4</u>	<u>35</u> ✓	
<u>5</u>	<u>1.3</u>	"	<u>3.3</u>	<u>20</u> ✓	
<u>6</u>	<u>2.1</u>	"	<u>4.1</u>	<u>18</u> ✓	
<u>7</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>4.2</u>	<u>25</u> ✓	
<u>8</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>4.6</u>	<u>28</u> ✓	
<u>9</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>4.8</u>	<u>33</u> ✓	
				<u>464</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. *31 Main Line - north -*

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. <i>140</i>	<i>3.1</i>	<i>25 ft</i>	<i>5.7</i>	<i>37</i> ✓	<i>All Exc (6) Auto diggers</i>
and Stake No. <i>1</i>	<i>3.2</i>		<i>5.2</i>	<i>42</i> ✓	
<i>2</i>	<i>2.8</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>4.8</i>	<i>39</i> ✓	
<i>3</i>	<i>2.2</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>4.2</i>	<i>20</i> ✓	
<i>4</i>	<i>1.6</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>3.6</i>	<i>10</i> ✓	
<i>5</i>	<i>2.1</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>4.1</i>	<i>10</i> ✓	
<i>6</i>	<i>2.1</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>4.1</i>	<i>13</i> ✓	
<i>7</i>	<i>2.2</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>4.2</i>	<i>13</i> ✓	
<i>8</i>	<i>1.9</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>3.9</i>	<i>12</i> ✓	
<i>9</i>	<i>1.9</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>3.9</i>	<i>10</i> ✓	
<i>150</i>	<i>2.2</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>4.2</i>	<i>10</i> ✓	
<i>1</i>	<i>3.1</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>5.1</i>	<i>20</i> ✓	
<i>2</i>	<i>2.6</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>4.6</i>	<i>32</i> ✓	
<i>3</i>	<i>3.2</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>5.2</i>	<i>37</i> ✓	
<i>4</i>	<i>2.4</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>4.4</i>	<i>35</i> ✓	
<i>5</i>	<i>1.3</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>3.3</i>	<i>20</i> ✓	
<i>6</i>	<i>2.1</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>4.1</i>	<i>18</i> ✓	
<i>7</i>	<i>2.2</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>4.2</i>	<i>25</i> ✓	
<i>8</i>	<i>2.6</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>4.6</i>	<i>28</i> ✓	
<i>9</i>	<i>2.8</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>4.8</i>	<i>33</i> ✓	
				<i>464</i>	
					Totals