

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 Main Line

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>2.4</u>	<u>2 ft</u>	<u>4.4</u>		✓
and Stake No. <u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>		<u>4.1</u>	<u>26</u>	✓
<u>2</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>4.2</u>	<u>25</u>	✓
<u>3</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>4.5</u>	<u>28</u>	✓
<u>4</u>	<u>2.0</u>	"	<u>4.0</u>	<u>26</u>	✓
<u>5</u>	<u>2.1</u>	"	<u>4.1</u>	<u>23</u>	✓
<u>6</u>	<u>2.0</u>	"	<u>4.0</u>	<u>23</u>	✓
<u>7</u>	<u>2.0</u>	"	<u>4.0</u>	<u>22</u>	✓
<u>8</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>4.2</u>	<u>24</u>	✓
<u>9</u>	<u>1.9</u>	"	<u>3.9</u>	<u>23</u>	✓
<u>10</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>4.2</u>	<u>23</u>	✓
<u>11</u>	<u>3.0</u>	"	<u>5.0</u>	<u>32</u>	✓
<u>12</u>	<u>2.7</u>	"	<u>4.7</u>	<u>36</u>	✓
<u>+60</u>	<u>1.8</u>	"	<u>3.8</u>		✓
<u>+80</u>	<u>3.5</u>	"	<u>5.5</u>		✓
<u>13</u>	<u>3.2</u>	"	<u>5.2</u>	<u>35</u>	✓
<u>14</u>	<u>2.0</u>	"	<u>4.0</u>	<u>33</u>	✓
<u>15</u>	<u>2.0</u>	"	<u>4.0</u>	<u>22</u>	✓
<u>16</u>	<u>2.4</u>	"	<u>4.4</u>	<u>25</u>	✓
<u>17</u>	<u>2.3</u>	"	<u>4.3</u>	<u>28</u>	✓
				<u>454</u>	
				<u>454</u>	
					Totals

All at Lemm Contractor's job.

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 *Main Line*

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>18</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>2 ft</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>26</u>	✓
and Stake No. <u>19</u>	<u>2.3</u>		<u>4.3</u>	<u>26</u>	✓
<u>20</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>4.6</u>	<u>29</u>	✓
<u>1</u>	<u>2.4</u>		<u>4.4</u>	<u>30</u>	✓
<u>2</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>4.5</u>	<u>29</u>	✓
<u>3</u>	<u>2.5</u>		<u>4.5</u>	<u>30</u>	✓
<u>4</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>4.5</u>	<u>30</u>	✓
<u>5</u>	<u>2.4</u>		<u>4.4</u>	<u>29</u>	✓
<u>6</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>4.6</u>	<u>30</u>	✓
<u>7</u>	<u>2.6</u>		<u>4.6</u>	<u>32</u>	✓
<u>8</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>4.6</u>	<u>32</u>	✓
<u>9</u>	<u>2.4</u>		<u>4.4</u>	<u>30</u>	✓
<u>30</u>	<u>2.3</u>	"	<u>4.3</u>	<u>28</u>	✓
<u>1</u>	<u>2.3</u>		<u>4.3</u>	<u>27</u>	✓
<u>2</u>	<u>2.4</u>	"	<u>4.4</u>	<u>28</u>	✓
<u>+60</u>	<u>3.1</u>		<u>5.1</u>		✓
<u>3</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>4.8</u>	<u>37</u>	✓
<u>+50</u>	<u>2.1</u>		<u>4.1</u>		✓
<u>4</u>	<u>3.4</u>	"	<u>5.4</u>	<u>32</u>	✓
<u>5</u>	<u>2.8</u>		<u>4.8</u>	<u>41</u>	✓
				<u>546</u>	
					Totals

All at sum (7) Curdoford

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 Main Line

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>55</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>2 ft</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>13</u>	All @ 8 cents per yd
and Stake No. <u>6</u>	<u>2.3</u>		<u>4.3</u>	<u>16</u>	
<u>7</u>	<u>2.7</u>	"	<u>4.7</u>	<u>23</u>	
<u>8</u>	<u>2.1</u>	"	<u>4.1</u>	<u>18</u>	
<u>9</u>	<u>2.4</u>	"	<u>4.4</u>	<u>18</u>	
<u>60</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>4.5</u>	<u>19</u>	
<u>1</u>	<u>2.3</u>	"	<u>4.3</u>	<u>21</u>	
<u>2</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>4.2</u>	<u>19</u>	
<u>3</u>	<u>2.3</u>	"	<u>4.3</u>	<u>26</u>	
<u>4</u>	<u>2.4</u>	"	<u>4.4</u>	<u>19</u>	
<u>5</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>4.2</u>	<u>18</u>	
<u>6</u>	<u>2.1</u>	"	<u>4.1</u>	<u>20</u>	
<u>7</u>	<u>3.0</u>	"	<u>5.0</u>	<u>24</u> ²⁴⁸	
<u>8</u>	<u>2.7</u>	"	<u>4.7</u>	<u>29</u>	
<u>9</u>	<u>3.1</u>	"	<u>5.1</u>	<u>30</u>	
<u>70</u>	<u>2.7</u>	"	<u>4.7</u>	<u>30</u>	
<u>1</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>4.2</u>	<u>22</u>	
<u>2</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>4.8</u>	<u>24</u>	
<u>3</u>	<u>2.3</u>	"	<u>4.3</u>	<u>24</u>	
<u>4</u>	<u>2.4</u>	"	<u>4.4</u>	<u>22</u>	
				<u>429</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. 33 *Main Line*

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>75</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>2ft</u>	<u>4.6</u>	<u>23</u>	✓
and Stake No. <u>6</u>	<u>2.6</u>		<u>4.6</u>	<u>24</u>	✓
<u>7</u>	<u>3.0</u>	"	<u>5.0</u>	<u>27</u>	✓
<u>8</u>	<u>2.9</u>	"	<u>4.9</u>	<u>32</u>	✓
<u>9</u>	<u>3.0</u>	"	<u>5.0</u>	<u>31</u>	✓
<u>80</u>	<u>3.0</u>	"	<u>5.0</u>	<u>31</u>	✓
<u>1</u>	<u>2.5</u>	"	<u>4.5</u>	<u>27</u>	✓
<u>2</u>	<u>3.4</u>	"	<u>5.4</u>	<u>31</u>	✓
<u>3</u>	<u>3.1</u>	"	<u>5.1</u>	<u>37</u>	✓
<u>4</u>	<u>3.0</u>	"	<u>5.0</u>	<u>33</u>	✓
<u>5</u>	<u>2.8</u>	"	<u>4.8</u>	<u>32</u>	✓
<u>6</u>	<u>2.0</u>	"	<u>4.0</u>	<u>22</u>	✓
<u>7</u>	<u>2.2</u>	"	<u>4.2</u>	<u>22</u>	✓
<u>8</u>	<u>4.1</u>	"	<u>6.1</u>	<u>38</u>	✓
<u>9</u>	<u>3.0</u>	"	<u>5.0</u>	<u>38</u>	✓
<u>90</u>	<u>2.7</u>	"	<u>4.7</u>	<u>28</u>	✓
<u>1</u>	<u>2.6</u>	"	<u>4.6</u>	<u>26</u>	✓
<u>2</u>	<u>2.1</u>	"	<u>4.1</u>	<u>21</u>	✓
<u>3</u>	<u>1.8</u>	"	<u>3.8</u>	<u>22</u>	✓
<u>4</u>	<u>1.6</u>	"	<u>3.6</u>	<u>18</u>	✓
				<u>523</u>	
					Totals

Add Eight Cents per yard

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 *Main Line*

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>95</u>	1.1	<i>2 ft</i>	3.1	13	<i>All at Eight (8) Cent per yard</i>	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓
and Stake No. <u>6</u>	3.7		5.7	28		
<u>7</u>	1.9		3.9	35		
<u>8</u>	1.6		3.6	19		
<u>9</u>	1.7		3.7	17		
<u>100</u>	2.2		4.2	22		
<u>1</u>	2.2		4.2	18		
<u>2</u>	1.8		3.8	15		
<u>3</u>	2.0		4.0	14		
<u>4</u>	2.0		4.0	16		
<u>5</u>	2.3	4.3	18	197		
<u>6</u>	2.6	4.6	15	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓		
<u>7</u>	2.5	4.5	21			
<u>8</u>	3.3	5.3	27			
<u>9</u>	3.5	5.5	27			
<u>110</u>	3.2	5.2	15			
<u>1</u>	3.8	5.8	22			
<u>2</u>	1.7	3.7	20			
<u>3</u>	1.6	3.6	11			
<u>4</u>	1.2	3.2	10			
			383		186	
						Totals

Bridge #124

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 Main Line

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>114</u>	<u>1.2</u>	<u>2 ft</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>10</u>	<i>All 8 Cubic Yards</i> ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	
and Stake No. <u>5</u>	<u>0.8</u>		<u>2.8</u>	<u>9</u>		
<u>6</u>	<u>0.9</u>	"	<u>2.9</u>	<u>7</u>		
<u>7</u>	<u>1.6</u>		<u>3.6</u>	<u>12</u>		
<u>8</u>	<u>1.8</u>	"	<u>3.8</u>	<u>18</u>		
<u>9</u>	<u>1.5</u>		<u>3.5</u>	<u>17</u>		
<u>120</u>	<u>1.6</u>	"	<u>3.6</u>	<u>16</u>		
<u>+85</u>	<u>4.1</u>		<u>11</u>	<u>6</u>		
<u>Estimate Main Line</u>						
<u>1584 yds @ 7¢ =</u>						<u>110 88</u>
<u>1470 " " 8¢ =</u>					<u>117 60</u>	
<u>Bridge at Sta 105.42 Main Line</u>					<u>12 00</u>	
<u>Total =</u>					<u>\$ 240.48</u>	
				<u>85</u>	<u>Totals</u>	