

EXHIBIT I.

VIEWERS' REPORT

— IN —

DITCH PROCEEDINGS.

Ditch No 32

Branch No 11

Estimated Cost
= \$ 217.92

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

Filed July 11 1898,
G. 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. 32 Branch No 11

Between Stake No. 30
and Stake No. 31

No work to be done from Stake 0 to Stake 30

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

DEPTH OF CUT
2.6
2.6
3.0
2.7
2.9
3.2
2.9
3.1
3.1
3.0
3.2
3.2
3.2
3.0
2.1
2.8
2.6
2.1
2.4
2.4

WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM
2 ft
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
"
"

WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP
5.9
5.9
6.5
6.0
6.3
6.8
6.3
6.6
6.6
6.5
6.8
6.8
6.8
6.5
5.1
6.2
5.9
5.1
5.6
5.6

NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED
25
31
32
30
31
48
47
50
48
50
52
52
50
37
35
40
33
31
34
756

ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD
7 1/2

All six (6) Contractors

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. 32 Brunet no 11

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>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>2 ft</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>1 1/10</u>
and Stake No. <u>1</u>	<u>2.6</u>		<u>5.9</u>	<u>39</u>	
<u>2</u>	<u>2.6</u>		<u>5.9</u>	<u>38</u>	
<u>3</u>	<u>2.9</u>		<u>6.3</u>	<u>41</u>	
<u>4</u>	<u>2.9</u>		<u>6.3</u>	<u>45</u>	
<u>5</u>	<u>2.4</u>		<u>5.6</u>	<u>39</u>	
<u>6</u>	<u>2.5</u>		<u>5.7</u>	<u>35</u>	
<u>7</u>	<u>2.4</u>		<u>5.6</u>	<u>20</u>	
<u>8</u>	<u>2.3</u>		<u>5.4</u>	<u>16</u>	
<u>9</u>	<u>2.4</u>		<u>5.6</u>	<u>17</u>	
<u>60</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>6.5</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>All dirt 161 Centes per yd</u>	
<u>1</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>5.9</u>	<u>30</u>		
<u>2</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>5.4</u>	<u>29</u>		
<u>3</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>6.5</u>	<u>23</u>		
<u>4</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>6.6</u>	<u>25</u>		
<u>5</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>6.8</u>	<u>24</u>		
<u>6</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>7.1</u>	<u>28</u>		
<u>7</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>7.1</u>	<u>30</u>		
<u>8</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>7.7</u>	<u>33</u>		
<u>9</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>6.6</u>	<u>32</u>		
			<u>60</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>1 1/10</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. 32 Branch 11

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>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>2 ft</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>All dirt (6) Centefers</u>
and Stake No. <u>1</u>	<u>2.5</u>		<u>5.7</u>	<u>20</u>	
<u>2</u>	<u>3.5</u>	"	<u>7.2</u>	<u>31</u>	
<u>3</u>	<u>3.2</u>	"	<u>6.8</u>	<u>26</u>	
<u>4</u>	<u>3.5</u>	"	<u>6.9</u>	<u>25</u>	
<u>5</u>	<u>3.5</u>	"	<u>6.9</u>	<u>25</u>	
<u>6</u>	<u>3.5</u>	"	<u>7.5</u>	<u>31</u>	
<u>7</u>	<u>3.5</u>	"	<u>7.2</u>	<u>33</u>	
<u>8</u>	<u>3.5</u>	"	<u>6.9</u>	<u>30</u>	
<u>9</u>	<u>3.5</u>	"	<u>6.9</u>	<u>28</u>	
<u>80</u>	<u>3.5</u>	"	<u>6.9</u>	<u>25</u>	
<u>1</u>	<u>3.5</u>	"	<u>7.2</u>	<u>24</u>	
<u>2</u>	<u>4.1</u>	"	<u>8.1</u>	<u>34</u>	
<u>3</u>	<u>3.5</u>	"	<u>7.2</u>	<u>37</u>	
<u>4</u>	<u>3.4</u>	"	<u>7.1</u>	<u>31</u>	
<u>5</u>	<u>3.4</u>	"	<u>7.1</u>	<u>31</u>	
<u>6</u>	<u>3.5</u>	"	<u>7.2</u>	<u>27</u>	
<u>7</u>	<u>3.5</u>	"	<u>7.2</u>	<u>24</u>	
<u>8</u>	<u>3.8</u>	"	<u>7.7</u>	<u>28</u>	
<u>9</u>	<u>3.3</u>	"	<u>6.9</u>	<u>31</u>	
				<u>5647</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. 32 Branch 11

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>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>2 ft</u>	<u>8.0</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>All done by Carterford</u>
and Stake No. <u>1</u>	<u>3.6</u>		<u>7.4</u>	<u>38</u>	
<u>2</u>	<u>3.6</u>	"	<u>7.4</u>	<u>30</u>	
<u>3</u>	<u>3.9</u>	"	<u>7.8</u>	<u>31</u>	
<u>4</u>	<u>3.6</u>	"	<u>7.4</u>	<u>28</u>	
<u>5</u>	<u>4.5</u>	"	<u>8.7</u>	<u>35</u>	
<u>6</u>	<u>3.7</u>	"	<u>7.5</u>	<u>36</u>	
<u>7</u>	<u>3.7</u>	"	<u>7.5</u>	<u>26</u>	
<u>8</u>	<u>3.7</u>	"	<u>7.5</u>	<u>50</u>	
<u>9</u>	<u>3.9</u>	"	<u>7.8</u>	<u>31</u>	
<u>100</u>	<u>3.7</u>	"	<u>7.5</u>	<u>29</u>	
<u>1</u>	<u>3.8</u>	"	<u>7.7</u>	<u>28</u>	
<u>2</u>	<u>3.8</u>	"	<u>7.7</u>	<u>28</u>	
<u>3</u>	<u>3.6</u>	"	<u>7.4</u>	<u>26</u>	
<u>4</u>	<u>4.2</u>	"	<u>8.3</u>	<u>28</u>	
<u>5</u>	<u>3.5</u>	"	<u>7.2</u>	<u>30</u>	
<u>6</u>	<u>3.7</u>	"	<u>7.5</u>	<u>27</u>	
<u>7</u>	<u>3.8</u>	"	<u>7.7</u>	<u>34</u>	
<u>8</u>	<u>3.7</u>	"	<u>7.5</u>	<u>34</u>	
<u>9</u>	<u>3.6</u>	"	<u>7.4</u>	<u>30</u>	
				<u>616</u>	<u>9 1/2</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. 32 Branch 11

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>	3.8	<i>off</i>	7.7	33	<i>All Eight 1/81 Centerings</i>	
and Stake No. <u>1</u>	3.7		7.5	37		
<u>2</u>	3.6	"	7.4	34		
<u>3</u>	3.6	"	7.4	33		
<u>4</u>	3.5	"	7.2	31		
<u>5</u>	3.6	"	7.4	30		
<u>6</u>	3.4	"	7.1	28		
<u>7</u>	3.6	"	7.4	28		
<u>8</u>	3.4	"	7.1	29		
<u>9</u>	4.1	"	8.1	33		
<u>10</u>	3.7	"	7.5	39		
<u>11</u>	3.6	"	7.4	34		
<u>12</u>	3.4	"	7.1	31		
<u>13</u>	3.7	"	7.5	32		
<u>14</u>	3.7	"	7.5	34		
<u>15</u>	3.5	"	7.2	33		
<u>16</u>	4.2	"	8.3	40		
<u>17</u>	4.2	"	8.3	44		
				603		10%
						<i>Estimate Branch 11</i>
					<i>1926 yds Ex @ 60 = 115.52</i>	
					<i>616 " " 7 = 43.12</i>	
					<i>603 " " 8 = 48.24</i>	
					<i>Bridge Center Road = 11.00</i>	
					<i>\$217.92</i>	
					Totals	