Drain: _CLARA GINTERT_   **Drain #:** _8_

Improvement/Arm: _JAMES C. WEBB #1_

Operator: _J. LIVINGSTON_   **Date:** _12-30-03_

Drain Classification: Urban/Rural   **Year Installed:** _1897_

GIS Drain Input Checklist

- Pull Source Documents for Scanning   _jwy_

- Digitize & Attribute Tile Drains   _jwy_

- Digitize & Attribute Storm Drains

- Digitize & Attribute SSD

- Digitize & Attribute Open Ditch   _jwy_

- Stamp Plans

- Sum drain lengths & Validate   _jwy_

- Enter Improvements into Posse

- Enter Drain Age into Posse   _jwy_

- Sum drain length for Watershed in Posse   _jwy_

- Check Database entries for errors   _jwy_

Gasb 34 Footages for Historical Cost
Drain Length Log

Drain-Improvement: _CLARA GUNTERT - JAMES C. WEBB #1_

Drain Type:	Size:	Length ( )	Length (DB Query)	Length Reconcile	Price:	Cost:
TILE	12"	1920'	1920'		4.00/lf	7680.00
	15"	3400'	3400'		5.00/lf	17000.00
OPEN DITCH	—	655'	655		19.55/lf	12805.25

Sum: _5975'_ _5975'_ _____ _$37485.25_

Final Report: _5975'_

Comments:

No...............

IN THE MATTER OF

Jas. C. Webb

Ditch

REPORT OF DITCH VIEWERS

COMMISSIONERS' COURT.

FILED

APR 2 1897

CALVIN STURDEVANT,
Aud. Hamilton Co.

Filed..., 18......

....

Auditor.

Viewer's Report of Jas. C. Webb. Ditch.

To the Honorable Board of Commissioners of *Hamilton* County, Indiana:

We, the undersigned, appointed by this Court, at its *March* Term, 18 *97*, to view a drain described in the certified copy of a petition and order of Court for a *Ditch*, by *Jas. C. Webb* and others, handed us by the Auditor, would represent that according to said order we, on the day named therein, to-wit: the *14th* day of *April*, 18 *97*, in company with *Jas. A. Mitchell*, a civil engineer, made an accurate survey of the line of said proposed *Ditch* from its source to its outlet. A plat of said *Ditch* 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 *$792.01* 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 *Public Utility, and will benefit two public highways, and the cost of constructing the proposed drain will be less than the benefits to be derived from the construction thereof —, That the proposed drain can best be accomplished by a tile ditch, with an outlet of an open drain:—*

(as indicated on Page 3)

The following statement shows who are benefited, the lands thereof and assessment 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:

NAMES OF OWNERS.	DESCRIPTION OF LANDS.			Section.	Township.	Range.	Acres Assessed.	H'dths Assessed.	Acres Benefited.	H'dths Benefited.	Amount of Benefits.	Amount of Asses'ments.	From Station.	To Station.	Feet Long.	Cubic Yards to be Removed.	Price per Cubic Yard.	Cost of Construction of Share.
Jas. C. Webb.	N E	N E	N W	32	20	5	10		5		18 60		0	32 46	3206	543	15¾	417.60
"	N E		S W	29	20	5	40		40		168 00						"	
"	S E		S W	29	20	5	40		40		168 00						"	
"	N E	S W	S W	29	20	5	10		10		42 00						"	
"	E ½	N W	S W	29	20	5	20		20		84 00	480 00					"	
C. Boughner. ✓	S W		S E	29	20	5	40		30		108	108	32 46	37 60	514	140	"	93.96
G. D. Klotz. ✓	Pr N ½	N E	N W	32	20	5	2		2		4 80	4.80	57 20	57 43	23	6	"	4 18
Margaret Waltz. ✓	6 A. out of E. side S E		N E	30	20	5	6		6		14 40	14.40	57 43	58 13	70	17	"	12 52
John Heisser. ✓	S E		N W	29	20	5	40		17		51 00	51.00	45 10	47 77	269	41	"	44 37
P. Snyder. ✓	S W		N W	29	20	5	40		40		120 00		38 13	45 10	677	124	"	117 45
"	S ½ S ½ S ½ N W		N W	29	20	5	5		5		15 00	135 00					"	
J. Gintert ✓	N W		N E	32	20	5	40		30		90	90 00	47 77	52 92	515	35	"	78 30
White River Township ✓	Public Highway E & W bet.			29/32	20	5					6 76						"	15 66
" " "	" " N & S. through			29	20	5					13 54	20.30	53 44	56 72	378	47	"	2 00
								Stone wall									
B. Gintert.	S W	N E	N E	32	20	5	10		20		3 43						"	
	N W	S E	N E	32	20	5	10		20		3 43	6 86	56 72	59 72	303	40	"	5 97

$792.01

Viewer's Report of Jas. C. Webb. 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.	

Commencing at the S.W. corner of the E½ of the NW¼ of Section 29 Township 20, Range 5 east, thence south 60° east 400ft., thence south 35° east 250ft. thence south 2° west 150ft. thence south 33° west 340ft, thence south 7° west, 260 ft. thence south 23° east 150ft. thence south 12½° east, 400ft. thence south 6° east 170ft. thence south 75° east 80ft. thence South 52° east 175ft. thence South 74° east 245ft. thence south 30° east 388ft, thence east 92ft, thence south 80½° east 100ft, thence south 41½° east 600ft, thence south 12½° east 400ft, thence south 44½° east 380ft thence South 65° east 220ft. thence north 88° east 150 ft, thence South 49° east 350ft. thence South 20° east 675ft. terminating in what is known as Sugar Run Creek, at a point about 200ft. east and 240ft south of the NW. corner of the SE¼ of the NE¼ of Section 32 Township 20 north. Range 5 east.

Manner of Construction

From station 0 to station 19+20, 1920ft. will be 1 row of 12 inch tile.
" " 19+20 " " 53+20, 3400 " " 1 " 15 " "
" " 53+20 " " 59+75, 655 " " " an open ditch, of depth & width shown on profile.

The tile used must be of good quality, well matched and laid in a true line, and at the proper grade, and must be inspected by the engineer before being covered. After being received by the engineer the tile will be covered to the depth of 18 inches in the old channel, and in the new cut the ditch must be filled full; and to the entire satisfaction of Engineer.

There is to be a protecting wall of Stone at the end or mouth of the 15 inch tile to be laid without mortar, and to contain not less than 2 cu.yd. of Stone.

GENERAL SPECIFICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

The length of the ditch as located is   5975 feet.

The fall of the established grade is   feet, from Station 0   to Station 11   , is 36/100 ft to 100 feet.

"   " 11 "   " 13 " 4/100 " " 100 "

"   " 13 "   " 17 " 25/100 " " 100 "

"   " 17 "   " 59+75 " 37/100 " " 100 "

The total fall is 19 08/100 feet to the Mile.

Viewers { E. C. Hill
James M. White
Joshua Carson