

Drain: REBECCA ROBERTS Drain #: 115
Improvement/Arm: _____
Operator: J. LIVINGSTON Date: 6-1-04
Drain Classification: Urban/Rural Year Installed: 1899

GIS Drain Input Checklist

- Pull Source Documents for Scanning
- Digitize & Attribute Tile Drains
- Digitize & Attribute Storm Drains
- Digitize & Attribute SSD
- Digitize & Attribute Open Ditch
- Stamp Plans
- Sum drain lengths & Validate
- Enter Improvements into Posse
- Enter Drain Age into Posse
- Sum drain length for Watershed in Posse
- Check Database entries for errors

J. Livingston
J. Livingston

J. Livingston

J. Livingston
J. Livingston
J. Livingston

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

Drain-Improvement: VERELCA ROBERTS

Drain Type:	Size:	Length	Length (DB Query)	Length Reconcile	If Applicable	
					Price:	Cost:
TILE	12"	2700'	2700'		4 ⁰⁰ "/lf	10,800 ⁰⁰
	15"	1900'	1900'		5 ⁰⁰ "/lf	9,500 ⁰⁰

Sum: 4600' 4600' \$20,300⁰⁰

Final Report: _____

Comments:

In the Matter of the Rebecca Robert
Drain

Report of Ritch Viewers

Commissioners Court.

Sept 9 - 1899

Report approved and viewers
ordered to make final report
Wed. Sept. 20 - 1899. Wm W Smith PB

Filed August 4th 1899

June 10-1899

In Commissioners Court June Regular Term 1899.
To Lewis Metker, Charles Kinsey, and Charles
Scott viewers and J. G. Mitchell engineer;
You are hereby notified that you were appointed
by the Board of Commissioners of Hamilton County
Indiana at their regular June term 1899 to
view a ditch or drain as petitioned for by
Rebecca Roberts, said ditch located as follows:
Commencing 50 rods north of the S E corner of
the SW 1/4 of Section 11 Tp 19 R 5 East, thence
running in a general north western direction
following the line of an old open drain
known as the Franklin Pierce Ditch as
far as practicable and terminating at a
point at or near 30 rods south of N E
Corner of SW 1/4 of Section 10 Tp 19 Range
5 East, following the lowest ground as
far as practicable. Said ditch to be a
tile drain. Tile to be shot tile.

You will meet at the place of beginning
of said proposed ditch on the 28th day of June
1899 at 9 o'clock A. M. then and there be
qualified by the engineer and proceed
with your duties according to law
and file your report with the County
Auditor.

Witness my hand and seal of
the Board of Commissioners
this 10th day of June 1899.
Calvin Studevant
Auditor.

June 28-1899

We the undersigned appointed to view the
within described ditch do each of us solemnly
swear that we will perform said duties to
the best of our knowledge and ability as we
shall answer to the State of Indiana on the
charge of perjury.

L. G. Metzker
Charles Kinsey
C. N. Scott

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 28th
day of June 1899

J. A. Mitchell
Surveyor Ham Co.

Order to View
Ditch Returned
for By Ruben Cabalante

Viewers Report of Rebecca Roberts Drain

To the Honorable Board of Commissioners
of Hamilton County Indiana

We the undersigned, appointed by this Court, at its June Regular Term to view a drain described in the certified copy of a petition and order of Court for a drain by Rebecca Roberts handed us by the Auditor would represent that, according to said order we, on the day named therein to wit the 28th day of June in ¹⁸⁹⁹ company with J. A. Mitchell, 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 cubic yards to be excavated to be excavated said drain and estimated the total cost for the construction of the work. at \$973.86 We also apportion and set apart to each parcel of land a share of said work in proportion to the benefits received, and all of which will fully appear by a tabular 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 be a benefit to the general health, will benefit two or more public highways and that the cost of the construction will not exceed the benefits derived therefrom and that said drainage will best be accomplished by a tile drain from its source to its outlet. ^{at the outlet of tile.} ^{and a retaining wall.}

Following same from 0 to 27 with 1 row of 12 inch tile and from 27 to 61+25 with 1 row of 15 inch tile, and open ditch from 61+25 to 68+20.

Said ditch located as follows:

Beginning 50 rods north and 17 feet east of the S.E. corner of the southwest quarter of section 11 Township 19 Range 5 East.

Thence running $S 83\frac{1}{2}^{\circ} W$ from stake 0 to 4.

Thence $N 30\frac{1}{2}^{\circ} W$ from stake 4 to stake 7.

" $N 54^{\circ} W$ " " 7 " " 10

" $N 88^{\circ} W$ " " 10 " " 18.

" $N 65^{\circ} W$ " " 18 " " 22

" W " " 22 " " 29

" $N 43\frac{1}{2}^{\circ} W$ " " 29 " " 38

Thence N. 60° W from Stake 38 to Stake 40

"	W,	"	"	40	"	"	42+30	
"	S	$52\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ W	"	"	"	42+50	"	45
"	S	30° W	"	"	"	45	"	48
"	N	57° W	"	"	"	48	"	53+30
"	N	60° W	"	"	"	53+30	"	57+65
"	S	$85\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ W	"	"	"	57+65	"	63+51
"	N	42° W	"	"	"	63+51	"	67
"	N	$17\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ W	"	"	"	67	"	68+20

and terminating 532 feet west and 80 feet north of the center of section 10 T₁₉ Range 5 east.

All tile used must be 2 feet in length and of first class quality in every respect and must be laid in ditch to the grade established, in a true line and must be inspected by the engineer in charge and when accepted the tile shall be covered so as to admit of cultivation over the ditch.

All timber shall be deadened and bushes and briars to be grubbed for a distance of 1 rod on each side of said ditch.

There is to be a retaining wall constructed at 61+25 dimensions 2 x 12 x 7 feet so constructed as to receive the tile at the proper grade and 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ feet above the base of the wall, made from field rock or ringerheads laid up in mortar made from 1 pt Portland Cement to 3 Parts good sharp sand.

	Names of Owners	Description of Land	Section	Township	Range	Acres Benefited	Amount of Benefits	Amount of Assessments	From Station	To Station	Feet Long	No of Cubic Yards	Price per Cubic Yard	Cost of Construction of Share
7	Frank Pierce	pt W. DE	11	19	5	21	52.32							
	"	SW SW	11	19	5	23	98.00	180.92	3247	2149	1627	138	15	148.13
10	Rebecca Roberts	pt DE SW	11	19	5	26	101.92							
	"	DE DE	10	19	5	38	148.96	250.88	1975	1749	1756	243		206.10
9	Jacob Schneider	pt S SW	11	19	5	8	31.86	31.36	21422	1945	217	31		25.76
8	Jesse Stevens Esq.	pt S SW	11	19	5	2 1/2	9.80	9.80	2149	21422	68	10		8.05
6	Catherine Finley	pt NW DE	11	19	5	10	39.20							
	"	NE SW	11	19	5	10	39.20							
		NW SW	11	19	5	40	156.80							
		S. Pt. NE DE	10	19	5	16	62.72	297.92	4643	3257	1392	206		244.74
	Fred Tescher	pt SW NW	11	19	5	5	15.00							
	"	SW NE	10	19	5	3	11.96	16.76	6842	6574	306	80		13.76
5	Geo. J. Groves	pt DE NE	10	19	5	5	19.60							
		SW NE DE	10	19	5	24	94.68	113.68	51428	4643	510	91		93.38
3	J.M. Castor	pt W. DE	10	19	5	41	160.72	160.72	63438	53457	766	298		132.03
1	W.H. Castor	N pt NW DE	10	19	5	24	94.08	94.08	5345	51428	429	72		77.28
2	F.P. Morris	pt NE SW	10	19	5	15	10.00	10.00	5345	63423	191	48		8.21
11	White River Sp. Hy N & O. Cont.		11	19	5		20.00	20.00	449	0	149	18		16.42

PROFILE PAPER.

No. of Station.	Depth of Cut.	Width on Top.	Width in Bottom.	No. of Cubic Yards to be Removed.	Price per Cubic Yard.	Total Cost per Station.	Cost of tile.	Cost of laying tile.	Cost of Filling Grubbing Grubbing
<i>B.M.</i>	4.68	<i>Top stone 5 ft south of C.</i>							
0	4.00	18	18		15		1.50	36	
1	4.44	"	"	12	"	10 86	7.80	36	1.90
2	4.51	"	"	12	"	11 46	7.80	36	1.50
3	5.07	"	"	11	"	11 31	7.80	36	1.50
4	6.11	"	"	11	"	11 31	7.80	36	1.50
5	6.48	"	"	14	"	11 76	7.80	36	1.50
6	7.45	"	"	14	"	11 76	7.80	36	1.50
7	8.21	"	"	14	"	11 76	7.80	36	1.50
8	7.85	"	"	14	"	11 76	7.80	36	1.50
<i>B.M.</i>	8.55	<i>Ashtree on north side ditch</i>							
9	6.19	"	"	13	"	11 61	7.80	36	1.50
10	7.86	"	"	13	"	11 61	7.80	36	1.50
11	8.49	"	"	15	"	11 91	7.80	36	1.50
12	8.25	"	"	15	"	11 91	7.80	36	1.50
13	7.72	"	"	15	"	11 91	7.80	36	1.50
14	7.64	"	"	15	"	11 91	7.80	36	1.50
15	6.33	"	"	14	"	11 76	7.80	36	1.50
16	5.98	"	"	14	"	11 76	7.80	36	1.50
17	6.44	"	"	14	"	11 76	7.80	36	1.50
18	8.47	"	"	15	"	11 91	7.80	36	1.50
<i>B.M.</i>	8.33	<i>Sugar tree 12 ft west of Stk 19</i>							
19	8.65	"	"	15	"	11 91	7.80	36	1.50
20	8.16	"	"	15	"	11 91	7.80	36	1.50
21	8.04	"	"	14	"	11 76	7.80	36	1.50
22	6.73	"	"	15	"	11 91	7.80	36	1.50
23	6.27	"	"	13	"	11 61	7.80	36	1.50
<i>B.M.</i>	5.55	<i>Hickory 3 ft SW</i>				2 3			
24	6.74	"	"	13	"	11 61	7.80	36	1.50
25	6.34	"	"	13	"	11 61	7.80	36	1.50
26	6.57	"	"	13	"	11 61	7.80	36	1.50

PROFILE PAPER.

No. of Station.	Depth of Cut.	Width on Top.	Width in Bottom.	No. of Cubic Yards to be Removed.	Price per Cubic Yard.	Total Cost per Station.	Cost of ties	Cost of Laying	Cost of Filling & Grubbing
27	5.73	18 in	18 in	12	15	11 46	7.80	36.	1.50
28	6.68	21 in	21 in	14	"	17 58	13.50	48	1.50
<i>B.M.</i>	5.71	<i>Chm 50 ft west of 28.</i>							
29	5.64	21 in	21 in	14	"	17 58	13.50	48	1.50
30	7.02	"	"	14	"	16 98	13.50	48	90.
31	6.66	"	"	14	"	16 98	13.50	48	90
32	5.21	"	"	14	"	16 98	13.50	48	90
33	5.77	"	"	14	"	16 98	13.50	48	90
34	5.96	"	"	14	"	16 98	13.50	48	90
35	6.83	"	"	15	"	17 13	13.50	48	90
36	6.44	"	"	15	"	17 13	13.50	48	90
37	6.65	"	"	16	"	17 73	13.50	48	1.50
38	6.74	"	"	15	"	17 73	13.50	48	1.50
39	7.31	"	"	15	"	17 73	13.50	48	1.50
40	7.36	"	"	15	"	17 73	13.50	48	1.50
41	7.28	"	"	15	"	17 73	13.50	48	1.50
42	7.53	"	"	15	"	17 73	13.50	48	1.50
43	7.67	"	"	14	"	17 58	13.50	48	1.50
44	8.18	"	"	14	"	17 58	13.50	48	1.50
45	7.13	"	"	15	"	17 73	13.50	48	1.50
46	7.62	"	"	15	"	17 73	13.50	48	1.50
47	8.19	"	"	17	"	18 03	13.50	48	1.50
48	8.10	"	"	17	"	18 03	13.50	48	1.50
<i>B.M.</i>	8.13	<i>Cherry 50 ft W.</i>			48.	"			
49	7.45			18	"	18 18	13.50	48	1.50
						397 02			

PROFILE PAPER.

No. of Station.	Depth of Cut.	Width on Top.	Width in Bottom.	No. of Cubic Yards to be Removed.	Price per Cubic Yard.	Total Cost per Station.	Cost of tile	Cost of Laying	Cost of Filling & Grubbing	
50	8.18	21 in	21 in	18	15	18 18	13.50	48	1.50	
51	7.74	"	"	18	"	18 18	13.50	48	1.50	
52	6.93	"	"	18	"	18 18	13.50	48	1.50	
53	6.58	"	"	18	"	18 18	13.50	48	1.50	
B.M.	<u>7.58</u>	Hickory 50 ft NW 53.							1.50	
54	6.73	"	"	18	"	18 18	13.50	48	1.50	
55	8.34	"	"	15	"	17 73	13.50	48	1.50	
56	7.14	"	"	15	"	17 73	13.50	48		
57	5.96	"	"	15	"	17 73	13.50	48	1.50	
57+65	7.45	"	"	10.	"					
58	6.25	"	"	16	"	19 38	13.50	48	1.50	
59	3.77	"	"	39	"	20 73	13.50	48	.90	
60	7.00	"	"	43	"	21 33	13.50	48	.90	
61	5.54	"	"	42	"	21 18	13.50	48	.90	
61+25		61 to 61+25 15 ft fall 5% Drop at 61+25 Stone wall and 2 sewer tile @ 61+25			9		5 10	3.40 20.00	12	2.3
62	2.14	6.28	2 ft	62	"	9 90			.60	
63	2.18	6.36	"	33	"	5 55			.60	
63+37	2.32	6.64	"	18	"	3 01			.31	
B.M.	<u>2.96</u>	Elm tree 20 ft from 63+37								
64	2.01	6.02	"	16	"	2 69			.29	
65	2.22	6.44	"	32	"	5 40			.60	
66	1.97	5.94	"	32	"	5 40			.60	
67	1.46	4.92	"	24	"	4 20			.60	
67+40	2.72	7.44	"		"				.60	
B.M.	<u>1.91</u>	Stone 16 ft south of 68.							.60	
68	1.24	4.48	"	25	"	4 35			.60	
68+20.	1.44	4.88	"	3	"	57.			.42	

The grubbing is estimated at 10 ft a Rod.

61+25 End of tile.

Stone Wall 2 x 7 x 12

Respectfully Submitted.

C. N. Scott
Charles Kinsey } Viewers
L. E. Mettler

Subscribed and sworn to before me this
the 4 day of August 1899.

Calvin Studebaker
Auditor Hamilton Co.

E 100 12

Page 137-138-139-140-141

Saturday
Sept. 9-1899.