

Drain: CHARLES OSBORN & JR COLLINS #2 **Drain #:** 8495
Improvement/Arm: JR COLLINS #2
Operator: J. LIVINGSTON **Date:** 5-12-04
Drain Classification: Urban/Rural **Year Installed:** 1902

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

JL

Sen / JL

JL

JL

JL

Continued from page 10

REVIEWERS
REPORT
ON
J.R. COLLINS DITCH
No 2

Report Approved
Ditch
and ordered to be
Constructed

June 3 1902

Levi Cook
P B

FILED

MAY 8 1902

Chas Powell
Assistant Hamilton Co.

REVIEWERS' REPORT OF JOHN R. COLLINS DITCH NO. 2.

TO THE HONORABLE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA:

We, the undersigned, appointed by this Court, at its April Regular Term 1902, to review a drain described in the certified copy of a petition and order of Court for a drain by John R. Collins and others, handed us by the Auditor, would represent that according to said order we, on the day named therein, to-wit: the 28th day of April, 1902, met and were qualified according to said order, and proceeded to review the action and report of the Viewers, as well as the entire premises through which the proposed work extends, and, after a careful and actual view of all premises and due consideration of all points set forth in the remonstrances handed us by the Auditor, submit the following Report:

We believe the proposed work as located by the Viewers to be of public benefit and utility, and that the cost of construction will be less than the benefits to be derived therefrom, and hereby report no changes in location.

We have 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 amount of credits and damages we believe to be due, the depth of cut, the width of bottom and width at top along said drain and the total number of cubic yards of earth to be removed from said drain, and the manner in which the work shall be done is also shown in this report.

The estimated cost is the same as shown in Viewers' report, being \$630.00.

J. R. Collins

LOCATION.

By a ditch commencing 511 feet East of the N.W. cor. of the S.E. 1/4 of section 22, Tp. 18 N., Range 3 east, Hamilton County, Ind. Running thence S. 5° W. to stake 3+70, thence S. 45-1/2° E. to stake 5+58, thence S. 62° E. to stake 8, thence S. 76° E. to stake 15, thence S. 26° E. to stake 16, thence S. 55° E. to stake 17+53; thence N. 68-1/2° E. to stake 18, thence N. 53-1/2° E. to stake 19+45, thence S. 36-1/2° E. to stake 22+40, thence S. 63-1/2° E. to stake 24+50, thence S. 19-1/2° E. to stake 26, thence S. 8-1/2° E. to stake 29, thence S. 25° E. to stake 31+75, thence S. 69-1/2° E. to stake 32+75, thence 85-1/2° E. to stake 34+91, thence S. 41-1/2° E. to stake 45+37, thence S. 15° E. to stake 49+73, thence S. 1-1/2° E. to stake 63+35, thence S. 16° W. to stake 65, thence S. 48-1/2° W. to stake 66, thence S. 72° W. to stake 71+30, thence S. 78-1/2° W. to stake 74, thence S. 75-1/2° W. to stake 83+70, thence S. 30° W. to stake 94, and terminating 800 feet south and 200 feet west of the S.W. cor. of the E. 1/2 of the S.E. Section 27, township 18 north, Range 3 east, Hamilton County, Indiana.

Said ditch to be 3 feet wide in bottom, with side slopes 1 to 1 or 45° and shall be constructed true to the line of the established grade, and slopes. All material excavated from ditch and banks to be deposited not nearer than two feet from the edge or break of the banks. At all such places as the ditch crosses the old channel, or runs along one side of the old channel the earth excavated from the ditch shall be placed in and along in such a manner so as to form a good new channel that the water will be kept in its proper course. All bushes and trees to be grubbed and removed from the ditch and outside the two feet from break of banks.

All work to be done to the full satisfaction of the County Surveyor.

The length of the ditch as located is 9400

The fall of the established grade is	²⁵ / ₁₀₀	ft. from Station 0 to Station ²⁷
" " " " " " " "	¹⁴ / ₁₀₀	" " " " " " " " to each 100 feet.
" " " " " " " "	⁵⁰ / ₁₀₀	" " " " " " " " ²⁵ / ₂₀ to Station 40, to each 100 feet.
" " " " " " " "	²⁰ / ₁₀₀	" " " " " " " " 40 to Station 83, to each 100 feet.
" " " " " " " "	³⁰ / ₁₀₀	" " " " " " " " 83 to Station 94, to each 100 feet.

The total fall is 24-65/100 feet to the entire ditch.

No.	NAMES.	DESCRIPTION OF LANDS.	Section.	Township.	Range.	Acres Assessed.		Acres Benefitted.		Am't of Assess't.		TOTALS.			
						Acres.	Hdths.	Acres.	Hdths.	\$	Cts.	\$	Cts.		
1 st	Mary J Haines	Pt N ² N ² SE	27	18	3	12	50	✓	10	00	}	3	75		
		Credit for work done							6	25		2	77		
2 nd	Mary A Brown	N side NW.	26	18	3	5		✓	1	50		1	50		
													1	10	
3 rd	Geo W. Butch	Pt S ² S ² NW	26	18	3	25		✓	32	50	}	20	00		
		Credit for work done							12	50		14	80		
4 th	Jennie Roberts	Pt N ² S ² NW	26	18	3	32		✓	42	60	}	25	60		
		Credit for work done							17	00		18	94		
5 th	John R Collins	NW.	26	18	3	40		✓	52	00		88	00		
		Pt NE	26	18	3	30			39	00		65	72		
		Pt NE	27	18	3	20			26	00					
		Pt SE	27	18	3	20			26	00					
		Credit for work done							55	00					
6 th	Nathan Heroey	Pt NW	22	18	3	10		✓	3	00		3	00		
													2	22	
7 th	Wm Small	Pt E NW	22	18	3	8		✓	1	60		1	60		
														1	18
8 th	John C Hinshaw	Pt NE	22	18	3	35		✓	10	50		10	50		
														7	77
9 th	F & Woodward Williams	NW	22	18	3	40		✓	40	00		20	00		
		Credit for work done & damage							20	00		14	80		
10 th	R Mae Hinshaw	Pt NW	22	18	3	5		✓	1	50		1	50		
														1	10
11 th	Stephen Hinshaw	Pt E ² NW	22	18	3	10		✓	3	00		3	00		
														2	22
12 th	Sabina Bruce	Pt NW NW	23	18	3	2		✓	60			60			

No.	NAMES.	DESCRIPTION OF LANDS.	Section.	Township.	Range.	Acres Assessed.		Acres Benefited.		Am't of Assess't.		TOTALS.	
						Acres.	Widths.	Acres.	Widths.	\$	Cts.	\$	Cts.
13 ^r	John Hinshaw	W. NE SE	22	18	3	40			✓	40	00	32	50
		Pt SE SE	22	18	3	35				35	00	24	00
		Credit for work done								37	50		
		Damage allowed.								5	00		
14 ^r	Lemuel Carey.	NW NW	23	18	3	40			✓	32	00	65	60
		NW NW	23	18	3	40				32	00	48	54
		Pt W. SE NW	23	18	3	8				1	60		
15 ^r	W F Carey Est.	Pt E NW	23	18	3	60			✓✓	18	00	18	00
												13	82
16	Dennis Garity	Pt NW NW	23	18	3	5			✓	1	50	1	50
												1	40
17	Barclay Henley	NW SE	16	18	3	40			✓	8	00	16	00
		NW SE	16	18	3	40				8	00	11	84
18	Andrew J Robbins	NE SE	16	18	3	40			✓	8	00	16	00
		SE SE	16	18	3	40				8	00	11	84
19	Etta Newby	N ² W ² NW	15	18	3	40			✓	8	00	12	00
		E ² NW NW	15	18	3	20				4	00	8	88
20	Emery Newby.	N ² NE NW	15	18	3	20			✓	4	00	4	00
												2	96
21 ^r	Cora Michael	E ² NE NW	15	18	3	20			✓	4	00	4	00
												2	96
22 ^r	Francis Hinshaw	Pt NW SE	15	18	3	31			✓	6	20	14	20
		NW SE	15	18	3	40				8	00	10	50
23	Emma A Hinshaw	Pt SE SE	15	18	3	15			✓	3	00	3	00
												2	22
24	J O & M Mahaffa.	Pt N ² NE	15	18	3	60			✓	12	00	24	00
		E ² NW NW	15	18	3	80				16	00	20	72
24a	W H Morris	N ² NW NW	15	18	3	80			✓	16	00	11	84
25	A. P. Rayle	SE NE	16	18	3	40			✓	8	00	8	00

No.	NAMES.	DESCRIPTION OF LANDS.	Section.	Township.	Range.	Acres Assessed.		Acres Benefited.		Am't of Assess't.		TOTALS.		
						Acres.	1/4ths.	Acres.	1/4ths.	\$	Cts.	\$	Cts.	
26	Harriett Jessup.	NE NE	16	18	3	40			✓	8	00	8	00	
												5	92	
27	Morris Jessup Esq	SE SE	9	18	3	30			✓	6	00	7	30	
		W side E ² SW	10	18	3	6	50				1	30	5	40
28	John Ortwin	PT NW NE	16	18	3	15			✓	3	00	27	00	
		SW NE	16	18	3	40				8	00	29	98	
		SE NW	16	18	3	40				8	00			
		SW SW	10	18	3	40				8	00			
29	W J Brattain	PT SE SW	10	18	3	13			✓	2	60	2	60	
												1	93	
30	D. A. & A W Clark	PT E ² E SW	10	18	3	14			✓	2	80	2	80	
												2	07	
31	Cleo W McWhorter	SW NW	23	18	3	40			✓	8	00	13	60	
		PT E ² NE	22	18	3	28				5	60	10	06	
32	Cyrus Johnson	PT SE NW NW	23	18	3	5			✓	1	00	1	00	
													74	
33	John Johnson	PT E ² & PT W ² NE	22	18	3	59			✓	11	80	11	80	
												8	78	
34	Sarah Jefferies	PT W ² NE	22	18	3	47			✓	9	40	9	40	
												6	96	
35	Cleo W Hinshaw	PT NW NE & PT NE SW	22	18	3	10			✓	2	00	2	00	
												1	48	
36	A W Hinshaw	PT W ² NE & PT E ² NW	22	18	3	35			✓	7	00	7	00	
												5	18	
37	Jas F Hinshaw	PT E NW	22	18	3	20			✓	4	00	16	00	
		SE SW	15	18	3	40				8	00	11	84	
		E ² SW SW	15	18	3	20				4	00			
38	Elios Hinshaw	W ² E ² NW	22	18	3	40			✓	8	00	8	00	
												5	92	
39	W. H. King	PT S NW NW	22	18	3	7	50		✓	1	50	1	50	
												1	10	
40	Edwin Davis	PT SW NW	22	18	3	23			✓	4	60	4	60	
												3	40	
41	Elmer Edmond	PT W ² SW NW	22	18	3	59			✓	10	00	10	00	
												1	26	

No	NAMES.	DESCRIPTION OF LANDS.	Section.	Township.	Range.	Acres Assessed.		Acres Benefited.		Am't of Assess't.		TOTALS.	
						Acres.	Hths.	Acres.	Hths.	\$	Cts.	\$	Cts.
42	E Wood Heuley	NE NE	21	183	40			✓		8 00		2 680	
		NW NE	21	183	35					7 00		19 83	
		SE NE	21	183	35					7 00			
		SW NE	21	183	24					4 80			
43	J Davis	NE NW SW	16	183	6			✓		1 20		1 20	89
44	John Gluder	NE SW	16	183	36			✓		7 20		11 20	
		E ² SW NW	16	183	20					4 00		5 28	
45	Solomon Cruise	PT SE SW	16	183	14			✓		2 80		2 80	207
46	L M Morgan	SW SE	10	183	40			✓		8 00		8 00	592
47	W. F. Stultz	PT SW SE	9	183	5			✓		1 00		1 00	74
48	L Caine	PT NW SW	10	183	10			✓		2 00		2 00	148
49	A Johnson	PT S NE SW	10	183	1			✓		20		20	15
50	R. P. Reynolds	NW SE	10	183	12			✓		2 40		2 40	178
51	John U Pruitt	PT W NE SE	10	183	3			✓		60		60	45
52	Narcissa Clark	PT SE SE	10	183	30			✓		6 00		6 00	444
53	W H Montgomery	SE cor. SE SE	10	183	1			✓	✓	20		20	15
54	Morton Johnson	PT NW NW	23	183	19			✓		3 80		3 80	280
55	Hamilton County	Gravel Road. N+S bet	$\frac{22}{23}$ $\frac{26}{27}$	18-3.				✓	✓	10 00		30 00	
	"	" " E+W. thro	$\frac{25}{27}$	183						20 00		22 20	
56	Washington Township	Highway. E+W. bet	$\frac{9}{16}$ $\frac{14}{15}$	183				✓		3		13 00	
	"	" " thro Creek	$\frac{13}{16}$	183						3		9 62	
	"	" " bet	$\frac{16}{21}$ $\frac{13}{22}$	183		$\frac{1}{2}$ thereof				4			
	"	N+S. bet	$\frac{15}{16}$	183						3			
57	Clay Township	" E+W. bet	$\frac{22}{27}$	183				✓		5		16 00	
	"	" " thro cent.	22	183						5		11 84	
	"	" N+S bet	$\frac{21}{22}$	183						2			
	"	" E+W. bet	$\frac{21}{22}$	183		$\frac{1}{2}$ thereof				4			

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.	
0	4.50	12.00	3 ft		20		
1	2.36	7.72	"	17	"	3.40	
2	3.13	9.26	"	13	"	2.60	
B.M.	5.32	Gray Ash. 55 ft S of Stk 2.					
3.	1.23	5.46	"	42	"	8.40	From stake
2+70	2.54	8.08	"		"		0 to stake 94
4	1.81	6.62	"	40	"	8.00	or Terminus.
5	1.38	5.76	"	15	"	3.00	the ditch to be
5+58	1.44	5.88	"	15	"		cut on the
6	2.16	7.32	"	15	"	3.00	Right hand side
7	0.94	4.88	"	27	"	5.40	stakes, looking
8	4.34	11.68	"	50	"	10.00	down stream
9	1.34	5.68	"	55	"	11.00	and to be cut
10	0.94	4.88	"	40	"	8.00	true to line
11	2.54	8.08	"	31	"	6.20	of stakes as
12.	4.56	12.12	"	45	"	9.00	staked by the
13	1.10	5.20	"	75	"	15.00	Viewers.
14	4.11	11.22	"	31	"	6.20	
15	2.99	8.98	"	12	"	2.40	
16	3.49	9.98	"	11	"	2.20	
17	0.97	4.94	"	15	"	3.00	
17+53	4.07	11.14	"		"		
18	3.66	10.32	"	15	"	3.00	
19	2.67	8.34	"	9	"	1.80	
19+54	3.99	10.98	"		"		
20	0.69	4.38		44	"	8.80	
B.M.	4.61	Gray Ash. 20 ft E. Stk 20					
21	4.00	11.00		80		16.00	
22	0.92	4.84		31		6.20	
22+45	0.72	4.44					
23	4.30	11.60		19		3.80	

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.
24	1.07	5.14	3 ft.	40	20 [¢]	8 00
24+50	5.01	13.02	"			
25	4.74	12.48	"	50		10 00
26	1.33	5.66	"	29		5 80
27	5.26	13.52	"	30		6 00
28	3.63	10.26	"	25		5 00
29	2.88	8.76	"	25		5 00
30	3.63	10.26	"	27		5 40
B.M.	6.18	White Oak 30 ft E of st 30.				
31	1.48	5.96	"	41		8 20
31+75	3.36	9.72	"			
32	5.53	14.06	"	48		9 60
32+75	5.68	14.36	"			
33	2.09	7.18	"	51		10 20
33+80	1.09	5.18	"			
34	No stake.		"	28		5 60
34+14	0.16	3.32	"			
34+91			"			
35	2.98	8.96	"	25		5 00
36	4.00	11.00	"	103		20 60
37	4.24	11.48	"	109		21 80
38	0.69	4.38	"	110		22 00
39	4.84	12.68	"	64		12 80
40	5.01	13.02	"	136		27 20
B.M.	5.79	Beech 12 ft E of st 40.				
41	3.76	10.52	"	120		24 00
42	3.59	10.18	"	62		12 40
43	1.95	6.90	"	36		7 20
44	1.13	5.26	"	52		10 40
45	2.69	8.38	"	47		9 40
45+37	4.01	11.02	"			

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.
46	2.52	8.04	3.8	15	20	300
47	2.16	7.32	"	12	"	240
48	2.87	8.74	"	15	"	300
49	2.95	8.90	"	13	"	260
50	2.46	7.92	"	13	"	260
51	3.12	9.24	"	16	"	320
52	4.17	11.34	"	16	"	320
53	3.19	9.38	"	25	"	500
54	2.84	8.68	"	28	"	560
55	4.73	12.46	"	19	"	380
56	3.90	10.80	"	18	"	360
57	2.40	7.80	"	16	"	320
18716	5.94	<i>Nail in Ash tree (East side of tree)</i>				
58	4.90	12.80	"	16	"	320
59	5.35	13.70	"	16	"	320
60	5.77	14.54	"	18	"	360
61	6.19	15.38	"	18	"	360
62	5.32	13.64	"	18	"	360
63	4.77	12.54	"	14	"	280
64	3.85	10.70	"	10	"	200
65	4.64	12.28	"	10	"	200
66	5.39	13.78	"	10	"	200
67	6.08	15.16	"	11	"	220
68	5.80	14.60	"	14	"	280
69	6.31	15.62	"	11	"	220
70	6.79	16.58	"	30	"	600
71	5.00	13.00	"	36	"	720
72	5.19	13.38	"	14	"	280
73	4.77	12.54	"	30	"	600
74	3.30	9.60	"	31	"	620
75	5.51	14.02	"	42	"	840

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.
76.	2.72	8.44	3.8	31	20¢	6.20
77	1.61	6.22	"	18	"	3.60
78.	4.15	11.30	"	17	"	3.40
79.	4.25	11.50	"	18	"	3.60
80	4.57	12.14	"	21	"	4.20
81	1.15	5.30	"	24	"	4.80
82.	3.45	9.90	"	91	"	18.20
83.	4.70	12.40	"	91	"	18.20
83+70	2.85	8.70	"			
84	3.22	9.44	"	40	"	8.00
B.M.	4.30	Bank Cut		27 ft NE. of St. 85		
85	5.33	13.66	"	124	"	24.80
86.	3.15	9.30	"	30	"	6.00
87	2.05	7.10	"	21	"	4.20
88.	3.13	9.26	"	17	"	3.40
89.	2.90	8.80	"	12	"	2.40
90	2.25	7.50	"	10	"	2.00
91	0.74	4.48	"	10	"	2.00
92	2.49	7.98	"	10	"	2.00
93	1.93	6.86	"	10	"	2.00
94	3.23	9.46	"	10	"	2.00
B.M.	5.68	Butter nut tree		35 ft E. of 93.		

We, the Reviewers, would further report that in our opinion it would be impracticable to allot said ditch for construction for the reason that if allotted there would be a great number of small allotments and the cost of receiving the same would be a great expense, and the work would be better and quicker done and at a less cost to the parties assessed, to sell the ditch in one contract. Therefore, we recommend that said work be sold by the Auditor of the County as provided by law in such cases.

Said Ditch to be cut to right hand side of stakes, looking down stream, and shall be cut true to the line of stakes as staked by Reviewers.

Except that in the construction the line of ditch shall be varied so as to miss the end fence Post mentioned in the Remonstrance of John Hinshaw Said Post being at or near Stake 22 ~~etc~~.

REVIEWERS.

John H. Coe
Jesse Deraney
J. B. Louke

Subscribed and sworn to before me, this 16th day of Mar,
1902.

Samuel Paul