
VIEWERS' REPORT

—IN—

DITCH PROCEEDINGS.

Ditch No 32

Branch 9

Estimated Cost
= \$187⁵³

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

Filed July 11th 1898

A. 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. 32 Branch No 9

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>19</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>2 ft</u>	<u>6.8</u>	<u>52</u>		<u>All down (7) Antepayed</u>
and Stake No. <u>20</u>	<u>2.8</u>		<u>6.2</u>	<u>47</u>		
<u>1</u>	<u>2.9</u>		<u>6.3</u>	<u>44</u>		
<u>2</u>	<u>3.0</u>		<u>6.5</u>	<u>46</u>		
<u>3</u>	<u>2.9</u>		<u>6.3</u>	<u>46</u>		
<u>4</u>	<u>3.2</u>		<u>6.8</u>	<u>40</u>		
<u>5</u>	<u>3.2</u>		<u>6.8</u>	<u>43</u>		
<u>6</u>	<u>3.4</u>		<u>7.1</u>	<u>32</u>		
<u>7</u>	<u>3.4</u>		<u>7.1</u>	<u>24</u>		
<u>8</u>	<u>3.2</u>		<u>6.8</u>	<u>22</u>		
<u>9</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>6.8</u>	<u>20</u>			
<u>30</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>6.9</u>	<u>16</u>			
<u>1</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>6.6</u>	<u>13</u>			
<u>2</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>10</u>			
<u>3</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>6.3</u>	<u>10</u>			
<u>4</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>6.3</u>	<u>15</u>			
<u>5</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>5.6</u>	<u>10</u>			
<u>6</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>6.2</u>	<u>10</u>			
<u>7</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>6.6</u>	<u>10</u>			
			<u>49</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>9 1/2</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. 32 Branch 9

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>38</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>2 ft</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>All done (7) Antepayed</u>
and Stake No. <u>9</u>	<u>2.6</u>		<u>5.9</u>	<u>16</u>	
<u>40</u>	<u>2.7</u>	"	<u>6.0</u>	<u>21</u>	
<u>1</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>6.2</u>	<u>26</u>	
<u>2</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>5.7</u>	<u>17</u>	
<u>3</u>	<u>3.0</u>	"	<u>6.5</u>	<u>20</u>	
<u>4</u>	<u>2.9</u>	"	<u>6.3</u>	<u>30</u>	
<u>5</u>	<u>3.5</u>	"	<u>7.2</u>	<u>33</u>	
<u>6</u>	<u>3.8</u>	"	<u>7.7</u>	<u>43</u>	
<u>7</u>	<u>3.9</u>	"	<u>7.8</u>	<u>48</u>	
<u>8</u>	<u>4.0</u>	"	<u>8.0</u>	<u>48</u>	
<u>9</u>	<u>3.1</u>	"	<u>6.6</u>	<u>39</u>	
<u>10</u>	<u>3.3</u>	"	<u>6.9</u>	<u>33</u>	
<u>11</u>	<u>3.3</u>	"	<u>6.9</u>	<u>35</u>	
<u>12</u>	<u>3.2</u>	"	<u>6.8</u>	<u>34</u>	
<u>13</u>	<u>3.2</u>	"	<u>6.8</u>	<u>37</u>	
<u>14</u>	<u>3.5</u>	"	<u>7.2</u>	<u>42</u>	
<u>15</u>	<u>4.5</u>	"	<u>7.2</u>	<u>45</u>	
<u>16</u>	<u>3.3</u>	"	<u>6.9</u>	<u>42</u>	
<u>17</u>	<u>3.2</u>	"	<u>6.8</u>	<u>38</u>	
				<u>267</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 9

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>58</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>Dft</u>	<u>7.2</u>	<u>36</u>	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ 9 1/10
and Stake No. <u>+75</u>	<u>4.7</u>		<u>9.0</u>	<u>00</u>	
<u>9</u>	<u>4.8</u>		<u>9.2</u>	<u>66</u>	
<u>60</u>	<u>3.9</u>		<u>7.8</u>	<u>70</u>	
<u>1</u>	<u>3.7</u>		<u>7.5</u>	<u>53</u>	
<u>2</u>	<u>3.4</u>		<u>7.1</u>	<u>46</u>	
<u>3</u>	<u>3.3</u>		<u>6.9</u>	<u>38</u>	
<u>4</u>	<u>3.4</u>		<u>7.1</u>	<u>40</u>	
<u>+40</u>	<u>3.2</u>		<u>6.8</u>	<u>11</u>	
<u>5</u>	<u>3.4</u>		<u>7.1</u>	<u>50</u>	
<u>6</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>6.6</u>	<u>53</u>		
<u>7</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>6.5</u>	<u>48</u>		
<u>8</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>6.5</u>	<u>47</u>		
<u>9</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>8.0</u>	<u>60</u>		
<u>20</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>7.4</u>	<u>68</u>		
<u>+83</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>8.0</u>	<u>54</u>		
			<u>729</u>		
					Totals

All down (7) Centerford
 Estimated Branch No 9
 2679 yards @ 79 = \$18753