

Wallisville Dec. 31. 1878.

Hon. W. C. Walsh

Comd. Genl. Land Office

Austin Texas.

Sir: I enclose you

a certified sketch of surveys, with references to which I make you the following statement, and respectfully ask your information with regard to the manner of correcting certain surveys shown in the plat, the field notes of which are erroneous, as I am at a loss how to proceed without some information from you, for I might make corrections in an improper way, and have my work to do over again.

1<sup>st</sup> Survey No. 17 E. H. R. Wallis needs correction. It is found that the S. line of alternate Sec. No. 2 is <sup>89<sup>th</sup></sup> farther south than the field notes of No. 17 place it - the West line of the H. Starns Survey being 1340 vs instead of 1429. vs to the margin of Lake Superior. bringing the S.E. corner of No. 2 & also the N.W. corner of No. 1. 89 vs further S. This reduces No. 17 in quantity - but by correcting No. 2 to its proper quantity, the deficiency of No. 17 may be supplied by covering the land between No. 2 & No. 11.

2<sup>nd</sup> No. 2 begins 962  $\frac{2}{3}$  vs N. of H. Starns N.W. corner, and thence West 2097 vs. Thence North at 253 vs. the S.E. corner of No. 11 - but cannot reach that corner for it is found to be 271 vs. W. & 200 vs N. of No. 2's beginning.

3<sup>rd</sup> It is found by measurement of the ground - beginning at the S.W. corner of No. 8 and running the lines at the variation used in making the surveys, that the N.E. corner of S. Mathus No. 15 falls 150 vs W. & 136 vs N. of S. Briles S.W. corner - bringing Thos. Tolly Survey No. 3 in conflict with Nos. 14 & 15 - to the extent of 130  $\frac{1}{2}$  vs.

4<sup>th</sup> also, this makes it necessary to correct No. 20

Counter 17567

File 17

Chambers County

Sketch & Explanation

filed January 29/79

W. C. Walsh

Comr

W<sup>2</sup>

W



5<sup>th</sup> No 4 also needs Correction of its East lines -  
The actual measurement showing 835 vs space be-  
tween its S line & N line of No 1 - while the Call  
on the Starnes line would leave that space  
951 vs. The Call for Starnes N.W. Corner should be  
~~85 1/2~~ instead of 85 1/4 ~~1000 vs.~~ and the Call  
on Starnes line 1108 vs. instead of 992 vs.

6<sup>th</sup> also No 1 should be corrected - probably, on ac-  
count of these changes by ~~moving it~~ making  
it Call for 89 vs. farther N. of Starnes N.W. Corner  
so as to retain its quantity - but have not yet  
investigated it. This survey begins on the lake at 134000  
<sup>from the lay office</sup>  
near a shell bank. Now, must this Starnes Survey  
Corner as soon as it reaches the margin of  
the lake at 1340 vs. or must it continue to  
the distance of 1499 vs.? Is it proper for a Sur-  
veyor to correct erroneous surveys and field  
notes - not patented, when discovered by him,  
without being notified <sup>of the error</sup> by the Commissioners of  
the Land Office?

Please examine the plat and in-  
form me if the surveys may be corrected as shown  
in it, and the above statement. It may be ne-  
cessary to make some slight alterations in the plat  
of correction, as there are likely some errors  
rather difficult to survey in an almost im-  
passible marsh, through which a great many of the  
lines run. This has caused a good many lines  
to be supplied by calculations in making sur-  
veys - it being almost impossible to run them -  
hence the errors that too frequently occur.

The fees of Surveyors are entirely too small, except  
for surveying on high open ground. Very Respectfully  
D. B. Wallis D. S. & D.