

Drain: Booth-Seward **Drain #:** 129
Improvement/Arm: MAIN
Operator: J. LIVINGSTON **Date:** 10-28-03
Drain Classification: Urban/Rural **Year Installed:** 1902

GIS Drain Input Checklist

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

QC'd Summary 11-24-2003 - slm OK ✓

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

Drain-Improvement: BATH - SNEAD

Drain Type:	Size:	Length ()	Length (DB Query)	Length Reconcile	If Applicable	
					Price:	Cost:
TILE	12"	1100'	1100'		4. ⁰⁰ /lf	4400. ⁰⁰
	14"	4360'	4360'		4. ²⁵ /lf	18530. ⁰⁰

Sum: 5460' 5460' 22930.⁰⁰

Final Report: 5460'

Comments:

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

Drain-Improvement: Booth - Seward Extension (2001)

Drain Type:	Size:	Length ()	Length (DB Query)	Length Reconcile	If Applicable:	
					Price:	Cost:
HDPE (TILE)	18"	50'	N/A		6.50'/ft	325.00

Sum: 50' N/A \$ 325.00

Final Report: 50'

Comments:
ALTHOUGH THIS DATA IS MOST LIKELY COMPLETED IT WAS NOT
ENTERED INTO THE GIS. IT IS SUPPLEMENTAL TO A RELOCATION
PROJECT THAT HAS NO ASBUILTS OR FINAL REPORT AND WAS
THEREFORE NOT ENTERED EITHER.

No.

IN THE MATTER OF

Booth & Smad Ditch
Report approved
and viewers ordered
to make final report
Oct 18, 1902

Levi Cook
P. B.

Report of Ditch Viewers.

COMMISSIONERS' COURT.

Auditor Hamilton Co.
Chas. C. Cook

SEP 4 1902

Filed FILED

Auditor.

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

14 - 525

108

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.	
<p>Location of Ditch: - The Booth & Smead Ditch is located as follows: - Commencing at a point 848 ft. north and 16 1/2 ft. west of the south west corner of the East Half of the Southeast quarter of Section 27 Township 18 North, Range 5 East in Hamilton County, Indiana, thence N 77° E from stake 0 to stake 5+45 = 545 feet; thence S 66° E from 5+45 to stake 11+18 ft = 573 feet; thence S 6 1/2° E from stake 11+18 ft to stake 23+27 = 1209 feet; thence S 32° E from stake 23+27 ft to stake 26+3 ft = 276 feet; thence S 23° W from stake 26+3 to stake 32 = 597 feet; thence S 27° E from stake 32 to stake 40+22 ft = 822 feet; thence S 6° E from stake 40+22 ft to stake 42 = 178 feet; thence S 33° E from stake 42 to stake 46+10 ft = 440 feet; thence S 8 1/2° W from stake 46+10 ft to 54+60 ft = 850 feet and terminating in Mud Creek at or near a point 755 feet south and 105 feet east of the northeast corner of the Southeast quarter of Section 34 Township 18 North, Range 5 East in Hamilton County Indiana.</p> <p>Requirements: - All tile used in the construction of this ditch shall be first class in every particular, and shall be laid in the ditch at the proper grade, properly matched and on a true line, and shall be examined and inspected before being covered and after being accepted by the Surveyor shall be covered with earth to the depth of at least 24 inches over the tile; all work to be done shall be done to the acceptance of the County Surveyor.</p> <p>Timber to be deadened for at least 1 rod on each side of the line of tile and all grubs or bushes to be removed that will in anyway interfere with the ditch.</p>							

GENERAL SPECIFICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

The length of the ditch as located is 5460 feet
 The fall of the established grade is _____ feet, from Station _____ to Station _____, is _____ feet.

The total fall is 20 78/100 feet to the

Station	Station	Fall	per 100 feet
0	8	15 7/100	100
8	33	36/100	100
33	38	39/100	100
38	42	50/100	100
42	46	80/100	100
46	54+60	44/100	100

We the viewers would further report that in our opinion it is impracticable to allow said ditch for construction for the reasons, we believe the work can be done in less time and to a better advantage to sell the contract to one contractor and we recommend the Auditor sell the same in accordance with the law in such cases.

W. P. Hamilton.
 Earl Kueffer.
 Ralph B. Henders.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, this 4th day of September, 1902
 This copy is from the Digital Archive of the Hamilton County Surveyor's Office, Noblesville, IN 46060
 Auditor Amuel County.

Viewers' Report of *Booth and Smead* Ditch.

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

We, the undersigned, appointed by this Court, at its *August Reg.* Term, 1902, to view a drain described in the certified copy of a petition and order of Court for a *ditch*, by *C. W. Booth & W. C. Smead* and others, handed us by the Auditor, would represent that according to said order we, on the day named therein, to wit: The *25th* day of *August*, 1902, in company with *J. 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 *\$1196.52* 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 convenience and the cost of construction will be less than the benefits to be derived therefrom; and that said drainage can best be accomplished by a tile drain from its source to its outlet. From Stake 0 to Stake 11 shall consist of one row of 12 inch tile; from Stake 11 to Stake 54+50ft shall consist of one row of 14 inch tile; and from Stake 54+50ft to Stake 54+60ft shall consist of one row of 15 inch salt glazed sewer tile. There shall be a retaining wall 26' x 2' x 6' built of field rocks or bricks laid up in mortar made from one part portland cement to three parts good sharp sand; the tile shall be placed through the wall on proper grade, and thoroughly slushed with mortar around the tile in the wall. The wall shall be built so as the base of wall shall extend 2 1/2 feet below the grade line of the ditch at end of tile.*

The following tabular statement shows who are benefited, the acreage 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:

(See Page 3)

NAMES OF OWNERS.	DESCRIPTION OF LANDS.	Section.	Township.	Range.	Acres Assessed.	F'ths Assessed.	Acres Benefited.	F'ths 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.
1 <i>W. C. Smead.</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>154</i>	<i>00</i>	<i>295.75</i>				<i>1774</i>		<i>278.39</i>
"	<i>NE</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>66</i>	<i>50</i>							
"	<i>pt SW</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>25</i>							
2 <i>C. W. Booth</i>	<i>Pr 1/2 NW</i>	<i>SW</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>00</i>	<i>90.00</i>				<i>540</i>		<i>84.72</i>
"	<i>1/2 SW</i>	<i>NW</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>00</i>							
3 <i>W. A. Morgan</i>	<i>E 2 NE</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>7.70</i>	<i>7.70</i>					<i>46</i>		<i>7.25</i>
4 <i>Michael Lowe Est.</i>	<i>S 2 SE</i>	<i>NE</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>38.50</i>	<i>113.57</i>					<i>6.81</i>		<i>106.00</i>
"	<i>1/2 NW</i>	<i>NW</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>19.50</i>	<i>19.50</i>	<i>75.07</i>								
5 <i>George Lowe.</i>	<i>E 2 1/2</i>	<i>NE</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>134.70</i>	<i>134.75</i>					<i>8.08</i>		<i>26.84</i>
6 <i>Marion J. Wood.</i>	<i>1/2 NW</i>	<i>NW</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>73.50</i>	<i>73.50</i>					<i>4.41</i>		<i>69.19</i>
7 <i>Simson Morgan</i>	<i>1/2 NW</i>	<i>NE</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>56.00</i>	<i>56.00</i>					<i>3.36</i>		<i>52.76</i>
8 <i>John Lowe & wife</i>	<i>1/2 1/2 NW</i>	<i>NE</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>14.00</i>	<i>14.00</i>					<i>.84</i>		<i>13.18</i>
9 <i>Rachael Keeling</i>	<i>1/2 NE</i>	<i>NE</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>77.00</i>	<i>95.20</i>					<i>5.74</i>		<i>89.61</i>
"	<i>1/2 1/2</i>	<i>SW</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>18.20</i>								
10 <i>Sarah Nicholson</i>	<i>1/2 1/2</i>	<i>SW</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>40.85</i>	<i>40.85</i>					<i>2.45</i>		<i>38.45</i>
11 <i>Sarah Manship</i>	<i>E 2 1/2 1/2</i>	<i>SW</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>3.25</i>	<i>13.00</i>					<i>.78</i>		<i>12.25</i>
"	<i>1/2 NE</i>	<i>SW</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>9.75</i>								
12 <i>Thomas Sherman</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>SW</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>16.25</i>	<i>16.25</i>					<i>.97</i>		<i>15.30</i>

59479

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		From Station.	To Station.	Feet Long.	Cubic Yards to be Removed.	Price per Cubic Yard.	Cost of Construction of Share.
									of Benefits.	of Assessments.						
3 J. A. Lowe	1/2 Pr NE	NW	34 18	5	25	25			16.25	16.25			415.97			15.30
4 Eli Brooks	1/2 SE	SW	27 18	5	40	40			70.00	70.00			4.20			65.90
5 Henry Conway	1/2 SE NE	SW	27 18	5	2	2			3.50	3.50			21			3.30
6 Margaret Goodman	1/2 W ²	SE	27 18	5	32	32			123.20	123.20			7.39			115.25
7 Fall Creek Township	Highway NTS Hwy.		27 18	5					40.00	90.00			5.40			84.73
"	" ETW bet. 26 27		34 18	5					50.00							55.21
										130.00						140.00