

Drain: HENRY BRIGHT **Drain #:** 192
Improvement/Arm: EDNA BRUNSON
Operator: J. LIVINGSTON **Date:** 10-29-03
Drain Classification: Urban/Rural **Year Installed:** 1905

GIS Drain Input Checklist

- Digitize & Attribute Tile Drains SLM
- Digitize & Attribute Storm Drains N/A
- Digitize & Attribute SSD N/A
- Digitize & Attribute Open Ditch JMJ
- Sum drain lengths & Validate JMJ
- Enter Improvements into Posse N/A
- Enter Drain Age into Posse JMJ
- Sum drain length for Watershed in Posse JMJ
- Stamp Plans N/A
- Pull Source Documents for Scanning JMJ

**Gasb 34 Footages for Historical Cost
Drain Length Log**

Drain-Improvement: HENRY BRIGHT - EDNA BRUNSON

Drain Type:	Size:	Length ()	Length (DB Query)	Length Reconcile	If Applicable	
					Price:	Cost:
TILE	12"	322'	322'		4. ⁰⁰ /lf	1288. ⁰⁰
	14"	500'	500'		4. ²⁵ /lf	2125. ⁰⁰
	15"	1218'	1218'		5. ⁰⁰ /lf	6090. ⁰⁰
	16"	1570'	1570'		5. ⁵⁰ /lf	8635. ⁰⁰
	18"	6'	6'		6. ⁵⁰ /lf	39. ⁰⁰
TOTAL		3616'				18177.⁰⁰
OPEN DITCH	—	9'	9'		19. ⁵⁵ /lf	175. ⁹⁵

Sum: 3625' 3625' \$18352.⁹⁵

Final Report: 3625'

Comments:

429

Report of Commissioners.

FAVORABLE.

Eda Brunson

FILED
FEB 19 1888

[Signature]
Clerk Hamilton
Circuit Court, Ind.

Filed _____, 1888

Clerk Circuit Court.

Wm. B. Burford, Printer, Indianapolis.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONERS.

To the Honorable Judge of the Hamilton Circuit Court:

The undersigned, Commissioners of Drainage, to whom was referred the petition of Eda Drumson for the drainage of South West quarter of South East quarter of Section 5 Township 20 north of Range 5 East

in Hamilton County, respectfully report that they have inspected personally all the lands described in said petition, and all other lands liable to be affected by the construction of the proposed work, and are of the opinion that the proposed drainage will improve the public health of that neighborhood. will benefit one public highway, will be of public utility, and that the same can be accomplished at an expense less than the aggregate benefits to the lands to be assessed, and after causing the necessary surveys and examinations to be made, they determined that the method of drainage should be as follows, to wit:

see 3rd page of report

They estimate the cost of constructing the work at four hundred and seventeen ^{1/2} dollars. They further report that they have estimated the benefits and injury

to the several tracts of land which will be affected by the work, as follows:

OWNERS.	DESCRIPTION.	S.	T.	R.	Acres.	Injury.	Benefit.
<i>Eda Calver</i> Eda Brunson Esq	SW ¹ / ₄ SE ¹ / ₄	5	20	5	40	\$15.51	
Samuel Martin ✓	NE ¹ / ₄ SE ¹ / ₄	8	20	5	40	12.50	
<i>Franklin</i> Calver, Brunson	NW ¹ / ₄ SE ¹ / ₄	5	20	5	40	6.00	
Jacob Lively ✓	E ¹ / ₂ SE ¹ / ₄ SE ¹ / ₄	5	20	5	20	40.00	
" " ✓	NE ¹ / ₄ SE ¹ / ₄	5	20	5	40	6.00	
John Hoeft ✓	SW ¹ / ₂ SE ¹ / ₄ SE ¹ / ₄	5	20	5	20	100.00	
Peter Eller ✓	N ¹ / ₂ NW ¹ / ₄ NE ¹ / ₄	8	20	5	20	7.50	
John Eller ✓	S ¹ / ₂ NW ¹ / ₄ NE ¹ / ₄	8	20	5	20	15.00	
White River Road	between	5	20	5		10.00	
Total assessment						\$532.00	

All of which is respectfully submitted.

James A. Mc Mullin
E. J. Cottingham

Commissioners.

3rd

By the construction of a ditch commencing 80 rods west and 40 rods north of S E Corner Section 5 Town 20 Range 5 and run hence

S 61 N	200 ft	S 38 N	100 ft
S 20 N	100 ..	S 1 N	100 ft
S 10 E	100 ..	S 25 E	300 ft 300 ft
S 45 E	400 ..	S 39 E	200 ..
S 29 E	100 ..	S 5 E	100 ..
S 10 N	200 ..	S 85 E	100 ..
S 62 E	200 ..	S 65 E	100 ..
S 80	200 ..	N 84 E	400 ..
South	160 ft	East	791 ft

And terminate 70 rods south and 40 rods east of N W corner of Section 9 Town 20 North of Range 5 East

Below is a tabulated statement of the depth of cut at each stake the width at bottoms and at top at each stake the number of cubic yards for each station of 100 ft and the cost per station of 100 ft

No. of Station.	Depth of Cut.	Width at Bottom.	Width at Top.	No. Cubic Yards.	Cost per Cubic Yard.	Cost per	Section.	No. of Station.	Depth of Cut.	Width at Bottom.	Width at Top.	No. Cubic Yards.	Cost per Cubic Yard.	Cost per	Section.
0	4	1	9.0	76	12 1/2	9	50	33	4.5	1	10.0	75	12 1/2	9	37 1/2
1	4.6	1	10.2	76	"	9	50	34	4.5	1	10.0	71	"	8	87 1/2
2	4.1	1	9.2	76	"	9	50	35	4.2	1	9.4	64	"	8	00
3	4.9	1	10.8	81	"	10	12 1/2	36	4.2	1	9.4	56	"	7	00
4	4.6	1	10.2	89	"	11	12 1/2	37	5.0	1	11.0	70	"	8	75
5	4.2	1	9.4	88	"	11	00	38	5.6	1	12.2	98	"	12	25
6	4.1	1	9.2	72	"	9	00	5/39	4.2	1	9.4	39	"	4	87 1/2
7	4.8	1	10.6	76	"	9	50								
8	4.3	1	9.6	76	"	9	50								
9	4.5	1	10.0	70	"	8	75								
10	4.6	1	10.2	71	"	8	87 1/2	Total number cu yds 3337							
11	4.3	1	9.6	63	"	7	87 1/2	Estimated cost \$417.12 1/2							
12	5.0	1	11.0	69	"	8	62 1/2								
13	5.4	1	11.8	91	"	11	37 1/2								
14	4.8	1	10.6	85	"	10	62 1/2								
15	5.1	1	11.2	81	"	10	12 1/2								
16	4.9	1	10.8	96	"	12	00								
17	6.3	1	13.6	102	"	12	75								
18	6.3	1	13.6	130	"	16	25								
19	7.3	1	15.6	151	"	18	62 1/2								
20	5.4	1	11.8	128	"	16	00								
21	5.6	1	12.2	102	"	12	75								
22	5.4	1	11.8	107	"	13	37 1/2								
23	5.5	1	12.0	108	"	13	50								
24	5.4	1	11.8	108	"	13	50								
25	5.1	1	11.2	101	"	12	62 1/2								
26	5.0	1	11.0	95	"	11	87 1/2								
27	4.7	1	10.4	88	"	11	00								
28	4.9	1	10.8	87	"	10	87 1/2								
29	4.8	1	10.6	83	"	10	37 1/2								
30	4.5	1	10.0	75	"	9	37 1/2								
31	4.3	1	9.6	68	"	8	50								
32	4.8	1	10.6	71	"	8	87 1/2								

1 He further specify that the banks
2 of said ditch shall be cut smooth and
3 of uniform slope and the earth exci-
4 vated therefrom be deposited not nearer
5 than two ft. of the banks of said
6 ditch. All work to be done accor-
7 ding to specifications, and to the accep-
8 tance of commissioner in charge.

9 He would further show that the follow-
10 ing named persons are entitled to
11 fees, for services in the matter, as
12 follows to wit,

13		
14	Samuel Martin	at man 1 day \$1.50
15	John Eller	Chairman 1.50
16	Frank Brown	Chair 1.50
17	Charles Dye	rod and compass ^{2 days} 4.00

18
19 He claim as fees for ~~services~~
20 as ~~Commissioner~~ of Drainage and
21 Engineer in the matter as follows:
22 to wit:

23	James McMullen	Commissioner 3 days \$9.00
24	B. J. Cottingham	Engineer 2 days 10.00
25	E. J. Cottingham	Commissioner 1 day 3.00

STATE OF INDIANA,

..... County,

} ss :

We, the undersigned, Commissioners of Drainage, swear that we have each personally examined each tract of land assessed for benefits and damages and the whole route of the proposed work, and that such drain is of sufficient capacity to carry, without overflowing, all the water which flows or should flow along such route, that no other lands than those described in this report will be either benefited or damaged by the construction of the proposed work, and that all the statements therein are true and correct, and that all assessments of benefits and injuries set forth therein are correct, just, fair and equitable to all parties concerned, as we verily believe.

James A. Mullan

E. F. Cottingham

} Commissioners.

Subscribed and sworn to by said Commissioners, this

12th

day

of *February*, 188*3*, before me.

J. R. Christie

Clerk Circuit Court.

No.

IN THE MATTER OF

Elisha Fouch
Drain

Report approved and
Ditch ordered constructed
Annual report made Aug. 19. '05
Aug. 9 - 1905
Hamilton Hutchins P.B.

Report of Ditch Viewers.

COMMISSIONERS' COURT.

FILED

AUG 17 1905

Filed

Isaac Powell

AUD. HAMILTON

Auditor.

Wm. B. Burtford, Printer, Indianapolis. 500-2-25-'99.

To the Honorable Board of Commissioners of

Hamilton

County, Indiana:

We, the undersigned, appointed by this Court, at its April Term, 1905, to view a drain described in the certified copy of a petition and order of Court for a Drain, by Elisha Fouch and others, handed us by the Auditor, would represent that according to said order we, on the day named therein, to wit: The 27th day of April, 1905, in company with H.L. Findley, a civil engineer, made an accurate survey of the line of said proposed Drain, from its source to its outlet. A plat of said Drain is filed herewith, including the survey by the engineer, marked "Exhibit B." We caused stakes to be set along said line, each one hundred feet, numbering down stream, as shown by plat. We also made a computation of the total number of cubic yards of earth to be removed from said drain, and estimated the total cost for the construction of the work at \$ 1018.00 Dollars.

We also apportioned and set apart to each parcel of land a share of said work in proportion to the benefits received, all of which will fully appear by a tabular statement in this report. We have also set out, by a statement below, the names of the owners of lands benefited, with a description of each tract of land, and the amount assessed against each tract. The depth of cut, the width at bottom, and width at top along said drain, is also shown in a tabular statement in this report. After a full and careful view and examination, we are of the opinion that the drain, as located by the survey, will be of a public utility and convenience and

a benefit to two public Highways and the cost of construction will be less than the benefits to be derived therefrom. and the best method to secure said drainage is by a drain as described on page 2 of this Report.

The following statement shows who are benefited, the lands thereof and assessments thereon, location, length of each share, amount of assessments, amount of benefits, amount of dirt to be removed from each share, price thereof per cubic yard, and total cost of each share:

925.00

NAMES OF OWNERS.	DESCRIPTION OF LANDS.	Section.	Township.	Range.	Acres Assessed.	Ft. Assessed.	Acres Benefited.	Ft. Benefited.	Amount of Benefits.	Amount of Assessments.	From Station.	To Station.	Feet Long.	Cubic Yards to be Removed	Price per Cubic Yard.	Cost of Construction of Share.	
																	From Station.
Joseph Lacy	Pl. NW	NW 8 20 5	7	7	78 00	78 00	72	19								7.72	
Hamilton County	Benefit to Local Road. W.D. between	8 20 5			15 00	15 00	13	88									1.48
Geo. W. Myers (Estate)	Pl. NE	NE 8 20 5	6	6	27 50	27 50	25	45									2.72
Elisha Fouch	Pl. NE	NE 8 20 5	34	34	180 00	180 00	166	58									17.93
Anna Overdorf	Pl. NW	NE 8 20 5	21	21	112 00	112 00	103	65									11.09
Isaac. Phenois	Pl. NE	NW 8 20 5	1	1	250	250	2	31									.25
White River Township	Benefit to Highway E & W between	8 20 5			60 00	60 00	55	53									5.94
Jacob Lively	Pl. N 1/2 E 1/2	NE 5 20 5	32	32	201 50	201 50	186	45									19.95
Alta Robinson	NW	NE 5 20 5	40	40	270 00												
Same	Pl. NW	NE 5 20 5	25	25	109 50												
Same	Pl. NE	NW 5 20 5	14	14	28 00	40 750	377	12									40.34
Z. J. Hobbs.	Pl. NE	NW 5 20 5	8	8	16 00	16 00	14	51									1.58

Viewers' Report of

Ditch.

TABULAR STATEMENT OF ASSESSMENTS, BENEFITS, ETC.

NAMES OF OWNERS.	DESCRIPTION OF LANDS.	Section.	Township.	Range.	Acres Assessed.	H'dths Assessed.	Acres Benefited.	H'dths Benefited.	Amount of Benefits.	Amount of Assessments.	From Station.	To Station.	Feet Long.	Cubic Yards to be Removed.	Price per Cubic Yard.	Cost of Construction of Share.
------------------	-----------------------	----------	-----------	--------	-----------------	------------------	------------------	-------------------	---------------------	------------------------	---------------	-------------	------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------

Location

Begins at a joint 810 ft North and 6 ft East of NW Corner of NE 1/4 of NE 1/4 Section 8-26-20 North Range 5 East from Thence South 52° West 252 ft Thence South 23° West 69 ft Thence South 2° West 204 ft Thence South 22° East 375 ft Thence South 47° East 454 ft Thence South 38° East 184 ft Thence South 25° East 443 ft Thence South 65° East 219 ft Thence South 78° East 622 ft Thence South 89° East 803 ft and terminating in an open drain known as Wash-Creek at a joint 240 ft North and 78 ft East of SE Corner of NE 1/4 of NE 1/4 Section 8-26-20 North Range 5 East in Hamilton County Indiana

Requirements

Said Ditch to consist of 11 rows over 12" drain tile from Sta 0 to Sta 3+22 and 11 rows over 14" drain tile from Sta 3+22 to Sta. 8+22 and over 15" drain tile from Sta 8+22 to Sta 20+40 and over 16" drain tile from Sta 20+40 to Sta 36+10 and over 18" sewer pipe from Sta 36+10 to Sta 36+16 and an open drain - 2 ft wide in bottom with side slopes 1 to 1 or 4 to 1 from Sta 36+16 to Sta 36+25.

At Sta 36+16 to be constructed stone retaining wall - dimensions 12' x 5' x 2' and to be built from field rock or large flags laid up in mortar made of Portland Cement to 3 part - good sharp sand and to be constructed as to receive the tile at proper grade 18" above base of wall and to have all joints pointed up in a good masonry like manner

All tile used in the construction of said drain to be first class in every respect and subject to inspection by County Surveyor and to be laid in the ditch on a heavy base with joints well matched and to be left uncovered until accepted by County Surveyor after being accepted to be covered to a depth of 24" from ditch run in old open channel and the trench of all new cut to be filled full. All trees to be deadened for a distance of 1 rod on each side of ditch

Viewers' Report of

Ditch.

TABULAR STATEMENT OF STATIONS, WIDTH, DEPTH, LENGTH, ETC.

STATIONS.	WIDTH AT TOP.		DEPTH OF CUT.		WIDTH AT BOTTOM.		WIDTH OF CLEARING OR TIMBER.
	Feet.	Inches.	Feet.	Tenths.	Feet.	Inches.	

GENERAL SPECIFICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

The length of the ditch as located is 3625 ft.
 The fall of the established grade is $\frac{20}{100}$ feet, from Station 0 to Station 34, $\frac{40}{100}$ " " 34 to each 100 feet.
 a "Drop" in grade of $\frac{30}{100}$ at Sta 36+16.
 The total fall is feet to the

The Viewers are of the opinion that it would be impracticable to allow said ditch for construction for the reason that we believe that it could be better done & in less time to sell the same in one contract and we recommend that the Auditor sell the same as provided by law

Viewers { A. B. Good
 Geo. W. Jones
 S. J. Noble

Subscribed and sworn to before me, this 17th day of May, 1905
 Isaac Powell Auditor Auditor County.