

Pleasanton July 18<sup>th</sup> 1876.

Now James B Shaw Dear Sir Enclosed herewith I forward you the corrected field notes of the work on the Lagunas Connecting said Surveys with those of Austin & Williams also field notes for other surveys with their Alternates I have carefully prepared them and balanced this work so as to be certain of their correctness. You may think it hard to have so much trouble with this work, but I do assure you that the fault is not entirely my own for I have in most cases found all of the old lines either too long or short for instance the Survey on which Pleasanton is situated I find by a careful measurement to be 3163 varas from East to West when the field notes call for 3008 varas E 3008 varas S 3008 west & 3008 varas North and the distance N & S is 3080 varas. These lines are all run at right angles and in a smooth country to measure in. The Survey on the N West of this Survey is another that compares well with those old surveys in this county it calls for a few varas over 1200 varas and measures 1070 varas with those as a sample of the old work is it possible for a surveyor to make his work fit exactly and run for miles in praise before he can find a survey's mistake? I readily answer No! this is not the worst for I find some surveys wanting in length and as we must bend to the situation I do it cheerfully and will call for all of those lines when I find them. I believe you want this work through I do most sincerely & to wind up all of those surveys last located I have located 5 sections on the County line of Atascosa & Frio Counties adjoining those surveys of yours in SW cor of this County. I have made these surveys and if they suit you I will have them recorded in Frio County and Record them in this County. Those surveys are of excellent black land with some sand in them about as rolling as those on the head of Little Walnut Creek N E of Austin with ~~an~~ a prospect of a good stone quarry on the S E survey I shall of course await your answer. July 19<sup>th</sup>.

On the Morning I received your favour of the 14<sup>th</sup> inst. with the report of Mr E Shultz for which I am thankful. I know that there

in some of these surveys that were formerly made by the Original Surveyors adjoining these lands of yours.

I will be able to make the required Explanations in a few days. I know you are anxious about this work and I have no hesitation in saying that you shall be entirely free from this care very soon. I am in doing all that may possibly can be done to get this work through correct and to the interest of yourself & the Co. Be patient a few days and I will send the work in in a corrected form. I herewith send you a plat of two surveys on the Cajunias I believe <sup>to be</sup> that it is correct and corrected field notes connecting the said work to those surveys on the San Miguel. This work I found by actual survey from their Old Corners. and you can rely on the connections given in said field notes.

Jan 22. On Yesterday I received your favour of Duplicate Cert. No 462. And field notes returned for correction I herewith transmit them to you - By the next mail from this place I will send you a plat or sketch with your work on south of Williams East of Mrs Jones and north of The Sanchez with a full explanation of their connections which will not change the County Map materially in the Genl. Land Office - The measurement of the E B lines of Williams. V B. Palmer <sup>1708</sup> year 5402 vs

The distance N. 50 E. to the survey made for Campbell is 1920 vs. Thence N 80 W 37 vs Thence N 50 E 116. vs to S cor of Coleman Thence N 40 W. 2338 vs Thence N 50 E. 1133 vs Thence N 40 W 1608 vs. to the beginning the lines which are ~~then~~ in the lines beginning. The corners of the Dunbar & Williams are one as shown on map. but the lines appear to be too short of the Dunbar and Coleman by 175 vs S 40 E. I make this statement from facts and of course you need have no fears.

Very Respectfully yours

Esch. M. Miron

I 15931

The Survey

Plantation June 18th 1876  
Genl Land Office

Now Chas. W. Propher Chief Draughtsman, will do me a kindness to change the field notes of the following surveys to read as follows to wit. Survey No. 1738. Certificate No. 472. Beginning on ~~the~~ W cor of. Sec No 1089. Thence S 45 W 2000 varas Thence S 45 E 1800 varas Thence N 45 E 2000 var. Thence N 45 W 1800 varas to the place of Beginning.

Survey No 1741. Certificate No 477 S 45 W 1900 varas intersecting N E B line of survey No 955. Survey No. 1750 certificate No. 458, <sup>calls</sup> Thence N 2190 var. N 1918 var. S 70 E 1003 var. E 1247 var. S 15 75 var.

Survey No. 1752. Cert. No. 456. Thence W 1314 var. N 2990 var. S 70 E 1398 var. S 25 12 var. Survey No. 1765 Cert. No. 466, <sup>calls</sup> Thence S 881 var. W 1652 var. S 35 4 var. W 1391 var. N 637 var. W 617 var. N 463 var. E 213 var. N 335 var. E 2497 var. S 200 var. E 950 var.

Course & Distance	N	E	S	W
S 881 var.		881		1652 var
W 1652 var		354		
S 35 4 var.				1391
W 1391 var.				
N 637 var	637			
W 617 var				617
N 463 var	463			
East 213 var			213	
N 335 var	335			
East 2497 var			2497	
S 200 var		200		
E 950 var			950	
Area 640 acres of land.	1435	1435	3660	3660
Sec No 136 cert. 469	Calls to end W 617 varas N 637. E 617 S 637 area of land 69 <sup>62</sup> / <sub>100</sub> acres			

Sur no 1764  
Cont. no 470.

Calls to read N. 1658. N. 1435 vs E 950 vs N 1303 vs  
East 1653 S. 355 west 944 S 2373 vs.

Sur 1777 x The call for R. marked East line is Erased on  
Records by Draftsman instructions.

Sur 484 <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> Records Read S50 W 1530 vs N40 W 1789 vs N60  
E 1530 vs N40 E 1789.

x Sur 1753 contains 640 acres of land and field notes should be corrected  
in these calls so as to read. N 1314 vs N 2990 vs  
S 70 E 1398. S 2512 vs.

Sur.  
x 1743 I forward to you Corrected field notes for 640 of  
land.

Survey 1699. x I forward to you Corrected field notes for all the vacant  
lands in that body containing 500 acres of land.

Sur no 1759 should read N40 E 381 vs N 1107. W 274 vs  
at 3446 varas intersecting the E. of 850 <sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>.  
S E cor of 1757 S50 E 2765 vs N40 E 987 vs S50 E 587 vs.

Sur 1764. <sup>calls should read</sup>  
N 1658 N 1435. E 950 N 1303 E 1653. S 355  
West 944 S 2373 vs. area 640 acres of land.

Survey 1715 Please change to read W 874 vs. S 2070 vs. E 2612 vs.  
N 40 W 2703 vs. N S E W  
E. + S. 874 | | | | 874  
S 2070 | 2070 | | |  
E 2612 | | 2612 | |  
N 40 W 2703 | 2070 | | | 1738  
2070. | 2070 | 2612 | 2612

Survey 1753 On the ground does not conflict with surveys  
no 1751 & 1752. the length of the west line of  
Estes extends north of Gorman. N E corner 1013  
varas and this survey is west of Estes and north  
of Gorman.

Sus.  
388 1/2

a copy of  
I herewith forward to you, the field notes of this survey.

The foregoing surveys are correct, and all records  
are made to correspond with the foregoing calls.

I will ~~also~~ transmit also a map connecting  
the surveys of Lucasius Creek to those on San Miguel

Hoping to hear from you and a report of your  
Examinations on said work at the earliest date I am  
Sir Yours with great Respect.

Enoch Moore.  
S. S. Alt. County

I will send you a correct and Certified sketch of those  
surveys of Van R. Palmer and W of the Tom Entries and  
N W of the Sanchez by our next Eastern Mail.

Yours Truly  
Enoch Moore & Co.

Sk. File No. 27(c).

Atascosa County

Dated Jan. 18, 1876.

Surveyor's statements  
concerning surreys in  
different parts of the county.  
Also certificates of correction

*Surveyor*

*John W. Taylor*

*John W. Taylor*  
*Surveyor*

Counter 13811