

Ditch No. 7

EXHIBIT I.

VIEWERS' REPORT

—IN—

DITCH PROCEEDINGS.

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

Filed July 19th 1890
G. M. Putnam
County Auditor

11/11/90
11/11/90
11/11/90

11/11/90
11/11/90
11/11/90

11/11/90
11/11/90
11/11/90

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. 7

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>	^{FT.} 0.7	^{FT.} 2.0	^{FT.} 3.4			
and Stake No. <u>1</u>	2.5	2.0	7.0	21	\$.08	✓
<u>2</u>	2.3	2.0	6.6	39	\$.08	✓
<u>3</u>	3.2	2.0	8.4	49	\$.08	✓
<u>4</u>	3.4	2.0	8.8	65	\$.08	✓
<u>5</u>	3.3	2.0	8.6	61	\$.08	✓
<u>6</u>	2.8	2.0	7.6	58	\$.08	✓
<u>7</u>	2.3	2.0	6.6	44	\$.08	✓
<u>8</u>	2.1	2.0	6.2	34	\$.08	✓
<u>9</u>	2.3	2.0	6.6	34	\$.08	✓
<u>10</u>	2.9	2.0	7.8	44	\$.08	✓
<u>11</u>	2.9	2.0	7.8	52	\$.08	✓
<u>12</u>	2.8	2.0	7.6	52	\$.08	✓
<u>13</u>	2.5	2.0	7.0	47	\$.08	✓
<u>14</u>	3.3	2.0	8.6	52	\$.08	✓
<u>15</u>	2.5	2.0	7.0	52	\$.08	✓
<u>16</u>	2.0	2.0	6.0	36	\$.08	✓
<u>17</u>	2.3	2.0	6.6	33	\$.08	✓
<u>18</u>	2.0	2.0	6.0	33	\$.08	✓
<u>19</u>	2.3	2.0	6.6	33	\$.08	✓
				839		
				7		
						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. 7

(2)

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT <i>Feet</i>	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM <i>Feet</i>	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP <i>Feet</i>	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD	
Between Stake No. <u>19</u>						
and Stake No. <u>20</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>2.0 ft</u>	<u>7.6</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>\$.08</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>21</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>7.0</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>\$.08</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>22</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>6.8</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>\$.08</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>23</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>6.2</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>\$.08</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>24</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>6.2</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>\$.08</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>25</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>6.6</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>\$.08</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>26</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>6.4</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>\$.08</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>27</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>6.4</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>\$.08</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>28</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>6.2</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>\$.08</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>29</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>7.0</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>\$.08</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>30</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>6.8</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>\$.08</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>31</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>6.6</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>\$.08</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>32</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>6.2</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>\$.08</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>33</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>7.0</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>\$.08</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>34</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>6.6</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>\$.08</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>35</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>6.8</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>\$.08</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>36</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>6.4</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>\$.08</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>37</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>6.6</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>\$.08</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>38</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>6.2</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>\$.08</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>39</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>\$.08</u>	<u>✓</u>
				<u>728</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. 7

(3)

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT <i>Feet</i>	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM <i>Feet</i>	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP <i>Feet</i>	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD	
Between Stake No. 39						
and Stake No. 40	1.6	2.0	5.2	25	\$.08	✓
41	1.3	2.0	4.6	18	\$.08	✓
42	1.4	2.0	4.8	16	\$.08	✓
43	1.5	2.0	5.0	18	\$.08	✓
44	1.2	2.0	4.4	15	\$.08	✓
45	1.2	2.0	4.4	14	\$.08	✓
46	1.7	2.0	5.4	18	\$.08	✓
47	1.0	2.0	4.0	15	\$.08	✓
48	1.4	2.0	4.8	14	\$.08	✓
49	1.0	2.0	4.0	14	\$.08	✓
50	1.1	2.0	4.2	13	\$.08	✓
51	0.8	2.0	3.6	11	\$.08	✓
52	0.5	2.0	3.0	7	\$.08	✓
53	0.8	2.0	3.6	7	\$.08	✓
54	0.8	2.0	3.6	9	\$.08	✓
55	0.8	2.0	3.6	9	\$.08	✓
56	0.6	2.0	3.2	8	\$.08	✓
57	0.9	2.0	3.8	9	\$.08	✓
58	1.0	2.0	4.0	11	\$.08	✓
				257		
						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. 7

(4)

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT <i>Feet</i>	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM <i>Feet</i>	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP <i>Feet</i>	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD	
Between Stake No. 5-8						
and Stake No. 5-9	0.9	2.0	3.8	11	\$.08	✓
60	0.6	2.0	3.2	9	\$.08	✓
61	1.0	2.0	4.0	9	\$.08	✓
62	1.0	2.0	4.0	12	\$.08	✓
63	0.8	2.0	3.6	11	\$.08	✓
64	0.6	2.0	3.2	8	\$.08	✓
65	0.8	2.0	3.6	8	\$.08	✓
66	0.4	2.0	2.8	7	\$.08	✓
67	0.6	2.0	3.2	6	\$.08	✓
68	0.6	2.0	3.2	7	\$.08	✓
69	0.5	2.0	3.6	7	\$.08	✓
70	0.7	2.0	3.4	7	\$.08	✓
71	1.2	2.0	4.4	12	\$.08	✓
72	1.1	2.0	4.2	13	\$.08	✓
73	1.0	2.0	4.0	12	\$.08	✓
74	0.9	2.0	3.8	12	\$.08	✓
75	1.0	2.0	4.0	12	\$.08	✓
76	0.8	2.0	3.6	11	\$.08	✓
77	1.0	2.0	4.0	11	\$.08	✓
				185		
<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. 7

SECTION	DEPTH OF CUT <i>Feet</i>	WIDTH OF CUT AT BOTTOM <i>feet</i>	WIDTH OF CUT AT TOP <i>feet</i>	NO. OF CUBIC YARDS REMOVED	ESTIMATED COST PER CUBIC YARD	
Between Stake No. 77						
and Stake No. 78	1.2	2.0 ft	4.4	13	\$.08	✓
79	1.2	2.0	4.4	14	\$.08	✓
80	1.0	2.0	4.0	13	\$.08	✓
81	1.0	2.0	4.0	12	\$.08	✓
82	1.2	2.0	4.4	13	\$.08	✓
83	0.8	2.0	3.6	12	\$.08	✓
84	1.1	2.0	4.2	12	\$.08	✓
84+63	1.0	2.0	4.0	7	\$.08	✓
				96		
				cu yds.		
Sheet No 1				839	at 8 cents	\$67.12
" " 2				728	" " "	58.24
" " 3				207	" " "	20.08
" " 4				185	" " "	14.80
" " 5				96	" " "	7.68
			Total	2099	" " "	\$167.92
						Totals