

EXHIBIT 1.

VIEWS' REPORT

—IN—

DITCH PROCEEDINGS.

Ditch No. 33

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

*Office of County Auditor
County of Anoka Minn.*

Filed August 27 1898

*J. W. Putnam
Co. 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. 33 Branch No 1

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. 0	2.0	1 ft	3.0		✓
and Stake No. 1	2.1		3.1	16	✓
2	2.7	"	3.7	17	✓
3	2.8	"	3.8	24	✓
4	1.7	"	2.7	18	✓
5	2.5		3.5	16	✓
6	1.6	"	2.6	16	✓
7	2.0	"	3.0	12	✓
8	1.8	"	2.8	14	✓
9	2.1		3.1	14	✓
10	2.0	"	3.0	15	✓
1	2.1		3.1	15	✓
+ 73	2.1	"	3.1	12	✓
				<u>189</u>	
189 yds @ 8¢ = \$15.12					
all Eight (8) Auto Sprayed on this branch nothing has been taken out for old ditch —					
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. 33 Branch No 2

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>1.5</u>	<u>2 ft</u>	<u>3.5</u>		<u>Eight Curdley</u>
and Stake No. <u>1</u>	<u>1.8</u>		<u>3.8</u>	<u>17</u>	
<u>2</u>	<u>2.0</u>	"	<u>4.0</u>	<u>21</u>	
<u>3</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>4.2</u>	<u>24</u>	
<u>4</u>	<u>2.1</u>	"	<u>4.1</u>	<u>24</u>	
<u>5</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>4.5</u>	<u>27</u>	
<u>6</u>	<u>2.4</u>	"	<u>4.4</u>	<u>28</u>	
<u>7</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>4.8</u>	<u>32</u>	
<u>8</u>	<u>2.9</u>	"	<u>4.9</u>	<u>36</u>	
<u>9</u>	<u>3.4</u>	"	<u>5.4</u>	<u>42</u>	
<u>10</u>	<u>3.2</u>	"	<u>5.2</u>	<u>45</u>	
<u>11</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>4.2</u>	<u>33</u>	
<u>12</u>	<u>2.9</u>	"	<u>4.9</u>	<u>31</u>	
<u>13</u>	<u>1.5</u>	"	<u>3.5</u>	<u>25</u>	
<u>14</u>	<u>1.9</u>	"	<u>3.9</u>	<u>18</u>	
<u>15</u>	<u>1.9</u>	"	<u>3.9</u>	<u>21</u>	
<u>16</u>	<u>2.0</u>	"	<u>4.0</u>	<u>21</u>	
<u>17</u>	<u>1.9</u>	"	<u>3.9</u>	<u>22</u>	
<u>18</u>	<u>2.0</u>	"	<u>4.0</u>	<u>22</u>	
<u>19</u>	<u>2.0</u>	"	<u>4.0</u>	<u>22</u>	
				<u>3600</u>	<u>100</u>
				<u>1511</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. 33 Branch No 2

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>1.8</u>	<u>Dist</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>✓</u>	
and Stake No. <u>1</u>	<u>1.8</u>		<u>3.8</u>	<u>19</u>		<u>✓</u>
<u>2</u>	<u>2.0</u>		<u>4.0</u>	<u>21</u>		<u>✓</u>
<u>3</u>	<u>1.9</u>		<u>3.9</u>	<u>19</u>		<u>✓</u>
<u>4</u>	<u>2.4</u>		<u>4.4</u>	<u>18</u>		<u>✓</u>
<u>5</u>	<u>3.0</u>		<u>5.0</u>	<u>27</u>		<u>✓</u>
<u>6</u>	<u>2.7</u>		<u>4.7</u>	<u>33</u>		<u>✓</u>
<u>7</u>	<u>2.6</u>		<u>4.6</u>	<u>27</u>		<u>✓</u>
<u>8</u>	<u>3.1</u>		<u>5.1</u>	<u>29</u>		<u>✓</u>
<u>9</u>	<u>2.3</u>		<u>4.3</u>	<u>30</u>		<u>✓</u>
<u>30</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>✓</u>		
<u>1</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>✓</u>		
<u>2</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>5.1</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>✓</u>		
<u>3</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>4.8</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>✓</u>		
<u>4</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>5.4</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>✓</u>		
<u>5</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>4.9</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>✓</u>		
<u>6</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>4.7</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>✓</u>		
<u>7</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>✓</u>		
<u>8</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>4.8</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>✓</u>		
<u>9</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>4.6</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>✓</u>		
			<u>522</u>			
					<u>All @ same (7) estimated per yd</u>	
					<u>Estimated Branch No 2</u>	
					<u>360 yds @ \$ 2.80 = 2880</u>	
					<u>702 " " 7 = 4914</u>	
					<u>Total = \$7794</u>	
					<u>Totals</u>	

