

EXHIBIT I.

VIEWERS' REPORT

— IN —

DITCH PROCEEDINGS.

Ditch No 32
Branch " 6

Estimated Cost
\$220.47

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

Bridge

Filed July 11th 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 6

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>0</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>2 ft</u>	<u>5.1</u>		✓
and Stake No. <u>1</u>	<u>2.4</u>		<u>5.2</u>	<u>10</u>	✓
<u>2</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>5.7</u>	<u>12</u>	✓
<u>3</u>	<u>2.4</u>		<u>5.6</u>	<u>11</u>	✓
<u>4</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>5.3</u>	<u>10</u>	✓
<u>5</u>	<u>1.9</u>		<u>4.8</u>	<u>10</u>	✓
<u>6</u>	<u>2.0</u>	"	<u>5.0</u>	<u>5</u>	✓
<u>7</u>	<u>1.9</u>		<u>4.8</u>	<u>5</u>	✓
<u>8</u>	<u>1.8</u>	"	<u>4.7</u>	<u>6</u>	✓
<u>9</u>	<u>1.9</u>		<u>4.8</u>	<u>6</u>	✓
<u>10</u>	<u>1.8</u>	"	<u>4.7</u>	<u>6</u>	✓
<u>1</u>	<u>1.7</u>		<u>4.5</u>	<u>8</u>	✓
<u>2</u>	<u>1.5</u>	"	<u>4.3</u>	<u>5</u>	✓
<u>3</u>	<u>1.8</u>		<u>4.7</u>	<u>5</u>	✓
<u>4</u>	<u>1.8</u>	"	<u>4.7</u>	<u>8</u>	✓
<u>5</u>	<u>1.7</u>		<u>4.5</u>	<u>10</u>	✓
<u>6</u>	<u>2.3</u>	"	<u>5.4</u>	<u>11</u>	✓
<u>7</u>	<u>2.2</u>		<u>5.3</u>	<u>10</u>	✓
<u>8</u>	<u>2.3</u>	"	<u>5.4</u>	<u>11</u>	✓
<u>9</u>	<u>2.3</u>		<u>5.4</u>	<u>32</u>	✓
				<u>181</u>	<u>4 1/2</u>
Totals					

Add line (6) Cost per yd

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 6*

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>20</i>	<i>2.2</i>	<i>2 ft</i>	<i>5.3</i>	<i>3.1</i>	✓
and Stake No. <i>1</i>	<i>2.1</i>		<i>5.1</i>	<i>29</i>	✓
<i>2</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>5.0</i>	<i>27</i>	✓
<i>3</i>	<i>2.0</i>		<i>5.0</i>	<i>26</i>	✓
<i>4</i>	<i>2.3</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>5.4</i>	<i>29</i>	✓
<i>5</i>	<i>2.1</i>		<i>5.1</i>	<i>30</i>	✓
<i>6</i>	<i>2.2</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>5.3</i>	<i>29</i>	✓
<i>7</i>	<i>3.5</i>		<i>7.2</i>	<i>44</i>	✓
<i>8</i>	<i>3.7</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>7.5</i>	<i>67</i>	✓
<i>9</i>	<i>3.8</i>		<i>7.7</i>	<i>65</i>	✓
<i>30</i>	<i>3.6</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>7.8</i>	<i>65</i>	✓
<i>1</i>	<i>3.6</i>		<i>7.4</i>	<i>63</i>	✓
<i>2</i>	<i>3.7</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>7.5</i>	<i>64</i>	✓
<i>3</i>	<i>3.7</i>		<i>7.5</i>	<i>65</i>	✓
<i>4</i>	<i>3.8</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>7.7</i>	<i>67</i>	✓
<i>5</i>	<i>3.7</i>		<i>7.5</i>	<i>67</i>	✓
<i>6</i>	<i>3.9</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>7.8</i>	<i>68</i>	✓
<i>7</i>	<i>2.3</i>		<i>5.3</i>	<i>50</i>	✓
<i>8</i>	<i>2.3</i>	<i>"</i>	<i>5.3</i>	<i>32</i>	✓
<i>9</i>	<i>2.3</i>		<i>5.3</i>	<i>32</i>	✓
				<i>950</i>	<i>4 5/10</i>
				<i>10</i>	
					<i>Totals</i>

All Dig (6) Cont'd from p. 1

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 6

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>2.2</u>	<u>2ft</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>31</u>	✓
and Stake No. <u>1</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>3 "</u>	<u>8.7</u>	<u>56</u>	✓
<u>2</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>9.1</u>	<u>87</u>	✓
<u>3</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>8.8</u>	<u>89</u>	✓
<u>4</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>8.5</u>	<u>82</u>	✓
<u>5</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>8.4</u>	<u>77</u>	✓
<u>6</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>9.0</u>	<u>82</u>	✓
<u>7</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>9.3</u>	<u>92</u>	✓
<u>8</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>9.1</u>	<u>94</u>	✓
<u>9</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>9.7</u>	<u>99</u>	✓
<u>10</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>9.1</u>	<u>99</u>	✓
<u>1</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>8.2</u>	<u>82</u>	✓
<u>2</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>7.8</u>	<u>68</u>	✓
<u>3</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>7.8</u>	<u>64</u>	✓
<u>4</u>	<u>4.4</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>8.8</u>	<u>74</u>	✓
<u>5</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>9.6</u>	<u>94</u>	✓
<u>6</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>9.3</u>	<u>99</u>	✓
<u>7</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>9.0</u>	<u>92</u>	✓
<u>8</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>9.1</u>	<u>91</u>	✓
<u>9</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>"</u>	<u>9.4</u>	<u>96</u>	✓
				<u>1648</u>	9/10
				<u>9</u>	
					Totals

All Run (7) Cuts beyond

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 6

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>4.2</u>	<u>3 ft</u>	<u>9.3</u>	<u>97</u>	✓
and Stake No. <u>1</u>	<u>3.8</u>		<u>8.7</u>	<u>89</u>	✓
<u>2</u>	<u>3.9</u>	"	<u>8.8</u>	<u>84</u>	✓
<u>3</u>	<u>3.4</u>		<u>8.1</u>	<u>77</u>	✓
<u>+40</u>	<u>2.1</u>	"	<u>8.1</u>	<u>28</u>	✓ 9/10
<p>Water in main line is 1.3 Oct. 10"</p>					
				<u>275</u>	
<p><i>Sum (7) Anticipated</i></p> <p><i>2023 yds Top @ 7¢ = 141.61</i></p> <p><i>1136 " " 6¢ = 67.82</i></p> <p><i>Total = \$209.47</i></p> <p><i>Bridge Small Road = 11.00</i></p> <p><i>\$220.47</i></p>					
<p>Totals</p>					