

HAYWARD, WIS., January 28, 1915.

Arthur A. Caswell, Esq.,
Auditor of Anoka County,
Anoka, Minnesota.

Dear Sir:

I am in receipt of a notice of Pendency of Petition, Repairs Ditch 49, which states that the pending petition will be heard, and considered by the board of County Commissioners of Anoka County, at your office February 17th 1915, at 10:30 A. M.

As the owner of Two (2) Hundred acres of land through which this ditch runs, located at what would be considered the upper portion of the main ditch, I respectfully protest against granting the prayer of the petitioners, Blanchett Investment Co., and two (2) others in their petition, dated December 17th 1914, and attached to the above mentioned notice, for the following reasons.

First. That said ditch when constructed was of sufficient depth and width to remove the surface waters from the lands adjacent, and from the lands intended to be drained by the ditch, and that the ditch has ever since satisfactorily drained said lands and the writer is informed and believes that said ditch is satisfactory to the owners of most of the land that would be drained into this ditch and satisfactory to all, except a small percentage of the owners of the land who contributed to the cost, or the expense of the construction of the ditch. It is true, and I concede that

2

HAYWARD, Wis.,.....191.....

this ditch, the same as any other needs cleaning out from time to time to permit the free flow of water in it, but it seems to me that the work of cleaning out this ditch can be performed without the aid of an expert, and at small expense.

Next, it occurs to me that the burden this ditch has been to the land owners who contributed to the expense of constructing it should be seriously considered by the Honorable County Commissioners before taking any action that will impose further burden upon the land owners, except such as may be necessary to clean out the ditch and to keep same in repair, so it will allow the free flow of water in it, the same as when first constructed. On my FIVE (5) forties, I have paid toward this ditch, the sum of \$888.03, on a total cost of the ditch of \$9173.47. This is a large amount for me to pay and I found it difficult to meet the expense. I think this large expense should be considered and for such reason, I urge economy in matters of maintaining the ditch, and I confidently believe that the Honorable County Commissioners, under all the circumstances, will take this view when it comes to act upon the petition in question. The petitioners ask that a Civil Engineer be appointed to ascertain and report the necessity for doing the work on the ditch, which the petition states, should be done, and report the cost of making the asked for repairs. I submit that the question of the necessity of working upon this ditch is one for the County Commissioners to decide, and that the question of cost of repairs is also for them to

decide. A Civil Engineer might report how deep or wide a ditch might be to carry off certain water, but I do not think, as stated that the questions of the necessity for the ditch or repairs on it to drain land, or the cost of repairs, ^{are} for a Civil Engineer at all. All that is asked for can be ascertained by the County Commissioners, upon inspection of the ditch. I think that all that is required to be done to this ditch, is to clean it out from time to time so that the free flow of water in it will not be obstructed.

The source of the ditch is Eau Claire Lake and about at my land, and to dig the ditch deeper across the same, and a long distance below the same, will only lower the water in the lake, and the water in the lake has not raised to a point high enough to overflow its banks, or damage the adjacent land to my knowledge.

In conclusion, I offer to keep the ditch across my land cleaned out and free from obstructions. *Please present this letter to the County Commissioners at time of leaving.*
Yours Respectfully,

John Engblom