



There are no line marks along here I expected to find a line here but I was disappointed.

Lots marked line and not very lawfully placed in my opinion

An 18" B.J. "H" of base brs. N44°30'W 2.5 vrs. only the charred stump remains, of the 8" B.J. bearing N11W 4 vrs. There is no doubt this is the original, as described by Jas. A. Brown. Sect. 12. 1878.

Witness trees present as described by J.A. Brown in notes of S.A. Castles Sur.

A 20lb rock in a B.J. stamhole and from which a 14" H.Ky. brs. S58°E. 6.3 vrs. Failed to find S.J. bearing N75W.9 vrs. However, there are S.J. bushes here about 100 yds. This could possibly be the original Murphy S.W. cor. but the Murphy N.W. cor. will be 37.8 vrs. short and the instrument reading would be badly off. The owner of the A.G. Rose gave this one acre for school grounds and says it is a part of the Rose Sur. Whether this Bldg. is on the Murphy or Rose Sur. is a question among some of the School officials.

I found no indication of cor. here, this is where G.D. Hendricks S. cor. should be, however.

The Carleton notes call for this line as being 841 vrs. and I found it to be 803.1 vrs. from rock at School house to N.W. cor. of Murphy.

This line is plainly marked

This point on the ground seems permanent. A 12" H.Ky. saddled at base brs. S55°E 15 vrs. The 14" S.J. bearing S11W. 15 vrs. is absent, however a surface depression is present and S.J. are abundant hereabout. I believe this cor. is beyond question the original. The timber here is free of pine abuse and only old marks are present.

W.H. CARLETON.
A-1304.
4. 1A. 1886.
11.5. 1900

B.F. MURPHY.
A-1042.
9. 12. 1878.

Took Tree ring count here on a dead top B.J. counting 44 yrs.

Took Timber scale count here on 8" scrub B.J. and found rings so fine or close, counting was difficult number above 47 years.

I found no corners or marks on this line, its position is call distance by Carleton notes. I have placed concrete monuments at these corners, but they can be moved if the Land Office disapproves this act.

There are no marks or monuments about this point. I show this point merely because course and distance would place it here and I was doubtful of the reckless marks on line N of Bldg. as here shown.

Two marked lines 7786 ft.

Marks along this line are not plentiful but are ample for identification.

A-1150
OSCAR BEGGS
7.12.1886.

This line is marked and the owner of the J.F. Marsh sur. claims it as his E. line.

S.A. HESTER SUR.
5.2.1876.

This point has wire fence mounds approx. 25 years old and at almost a proper position where a 12" dead B.J. stump would bear N57E. 7 vrs.

Cor. near marsh, no evidence present

A-1108
A.G. ROSE
10.7.1892.

Position where fence posts and stakes would place are no marks along here and the owner of the Rose sur. says there was never a line here that he remembers.

There are no marks along here that I am able to find.

There is no indication of a cor. here, however, this Goolsby N.E. is well marked and only 7 years old.

This line is well marked. 7 years old.

This point at bisection of two marked lines. A 10" H.Ky. "H" of base brs. S27W. 8 vrs. said B.J. bearing N42E. is absent. Surface depression present.

A-1291
J.M.F. JONES
5.7.1914.

Since the owner of the Rose Sur. claims there is a vacancy between him and the Jones Sur. I would place this 900 yds. for Rose Marsh. But there are no line marks along here.

The position where this cor. should be 5.7 vrs. S.W. of the alignment of the marks. Which is acceptable? The 16" B.J. brs. S53W. 14.5 vrs. as per corrected Goolsby notes is present.

Find no indication of cor. at either of these points.

Rambling marked line between 15 and 18 yrs. old about 7 vrs. wide, no marked corners. Yet the owner of the Rose Sur. claims it as his S.L. This position would short the Murphy Sur. about 27 vrs.

Now, in case this point was acceptable as the Rose Sur. would this develop or create a vacancy between the O. Beggs and W.H. Carleton surveys? Would the defective description of the Carleton Sur. develop a vacancy? Or would the Carleton absorb all slack by virtue of there being no marked line across its area. I am unable to answer this question and will not place any monuments without the approval of the General Land Office.

A-1292
W.H. JONES
10.3.1899.

Original Cor. of Jas. Goolsby as described by G.T. Leshotte, June 11, 1924. A 1" B.J. brs. S17W. 8.5 vrs.

There are two distinct lines along here. 48 yrs. at wide end, Goolsby line 7 years old. Jones and Taylor line 30 years old.

This point is in perfect alignment and has one witness stamhole a 9" S.J. "H" at base brs. N85E. 2 vrs.

Unable to identify this Cor. Timber abused, rambling fence. Waste sand flat.

-LEGEND-
 --- WIRE FENCING.
 - - - - - DOUBTFUL MARKS.
 - - - - - MARSHY AREA.
 - - - - - LINES WHOSE POSITIONS ARE VERY DOUBTFUL.
 - - - - - NARROW ROAD-WAYS.

-SCALE-
 1" = 180 YARDS
 MAG. DECL. 9°45'00"E
 AREA ABOUT 8 MI. NISE FROM COUNTY SITE LEON CO. TEX. NOVEMBER 24. 1931.

I, H.B. ALLISON, COUNTY SURVEYOR OF LEON COUNTY TEXAS, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE ABOVE AND FOREGOING PENCIL PLAT IDES CORRECTLY REPRESENT THE CONDITIONS I FOUND ON THE GROUND OVER THIS AREA. THIS NOVEMBER, 1931.
 H.B. Allison
 C.S. & G.

YELLOW SHADE COVERS AREA UPON WHICH I HAVE APPLICATIONS TO SURVEY (GEASE)