

1009

Wichita Falls, Texas
February 19, 1940

General Land Office
Austin, Texas

Re: S.F. 14144
S.F. 14145
S.F. 14146
S.F. 14147
Also corrected field notes to Section No.13 H.T.&B.R.R.Co. Survey Clay Co., Texas.

Gentlemen:

In regard to the above applications filed September 25th. 1939, I have made a complete survey of the area around said tracts and from original corners found and identified I am submitting the following report:

The surveys could be divided into four groups, the T E & L Co. surveys which were located in 1853, the various surveys located by Wm Hudson in 1854, the various surveys located by Wm Howeth in 1855, then the H T & B R Co. surveys located in 1872 by A.L. Shoemaker, these various surveys form the boundary to the area within which the alleged vacancies are located.

I first went to the Northwest corner of Survey No.2694 T E & L Co. and found a set stone from which I ran N 89*20' E, at 47 varas crossed a branch as called for in the original notes at 2688 varas a point in the center of a public road running East and South and is the recognized corner for the NE corner of Survey No.2695, I then returned to the set stone at the NW corner of Survey No.2694 and ran South 0*40'E at 108.5 varas crossed branch at 536.2 varas crossed another branch, at 1058.9 signs of an old road running E & W, at 1201.5 varas crossed another branch, these were all crossed at the called for distance in the original field notes and at 1344 varas to a point for the NE corner of survey No.2687, I ran S 89*20' W from here and established the North line of the T E & L Co. surveys, I found no evidence of original corners along this line but did run along the North line of a public road located for the North line of Survey No.2690 and along the center of a road located for the South line of the J.A. Scott surveys No.1 and No.2, I could-not find the original SE corner of the J.A. Scott No.1, so I then went to the original SW corner of the Calhoun County School Land survey which can be identified from its original bearing tree a PO about 34 inches in diameter(N 235 varas), I ran South from this corner or S 0*25'E, at 1761.5 varas crossed branch, original field notes call for 1770 varas and at 1891.5 varas to a point for the SE corner of the Alonzo Kean survey and the SW corner of the G.W. Chambers survey, thence I ran N 89*35' E at 809.7 varas I found a pile of stone from which a large PO bears S 60 W 10 varas and another large PO stump bears S 68 W 20 varas, this is the correct course and distance for the bearing trees for this corner and I am certain that they are the original bearing trees inasmuch as they are very old trees and very few PO trees are located near here, along this line I also crosses a branch at 200 varas as called for in the original notes, I continued on same course from this corner 740.1 varas to a point for the NE corner of the B.F.Bradford survey No.12, found nothing here but placed 2.1 varas excess in this line for the reason that by running South from here it will check out with another corner, the SE corner of the M.B. Atkinson survey No.8 which can be identified, I ran South 0*25' E, at 1757.5 varas to a point for the NW corner of the M.B. Atkinson survey No.8, the bearing trees are gone here but the corner comes just North of a creek

B

Counter 18472

a few varas on which there are now growing a number of Hackberry treest as called for but none in the right position at the present time, from here I followed the work of Wm Hudson who located a number of the surveys lying South and East of this corner, I ran South from the point set for the NW corner of the M.B. Atkinson survey No. 8, at 1147 varas crossed creek, original field notes call for this to be at 1113, at 2688 varas a point for the SW corner of the M.B. Atkinson survey, this point is located in an old road running E & W, from here I ran East 1344 varas to a point from which I found a large three prong PO bear S 22° E 30 varas, the trunk of this PO is about 40 inches in diameter and the three prongs are about 18 inches in diameter, this is a very unusual tree and I am sure it is the original bearing tree due to the age of it and the original call for a three prong PO, a hackberry tree about 3 inches in diameter is growing from the trunk of the PO and located between the prongs just wanted to call your attention to this as it is an unusual freak of nature, from this corner I ran West 82 varas to a point for the NW corner of the J.J. Hand survey, thence South 556 varas to a point for the SW corner of the J.J. Hand survey, thence South along the West line of the Joseph Gamble Survey, at 1104 varas crossed branch, original field notes call for 1100 varas, at 2611 varas crossed branch which is the correct distance according to original field notes, at 2688 varas the called for distance to the SW corner of the Joseph Gamble survey there are a number of PO's growing but none that I could identify as the bearing trees so I continued South a total distance of 2899.5 varas, for the reason I will explain later, and established a point for the SW corner of the Joseph Gamble survey, this point also comes in an old established road and property line, thence East at 850 varas leave road and continuing on same course in all 2858.2 varas to a point from which I found an old PO tree which has fallen over bears North 11° E 97 varas this is the correct course and distance for the bearing tree for this corner and if I had run East from the call distance for the West line of the Gamble survey I would have been 211.5 varas North of this point and this would have been in a mesquit area and I could not find any signs of any PO trees having ever been located North of here for some distance hence I think the Joseph Gamble survey has an excess N & S of 211.5 varas, from here I ran South or from the corner located as the SE corner of the J. Gamble survey along the East line of the J.A. Scott survey No. 3, now the W.F. Wilson survey, 1839.1 varas to a point for the SE corner of the W.F. Wilson survey and in the North line of the J.A. Scott survey No. 1 and by running West from here you cross a creek at 478 varas original notes call for 450 varas, thence I ran East along the North line of the J.A. Scott survey 1800 varas to a point for its NE corner, thence South 1939.8 varas to a point in the North line of the T E & L co. surveys as heretofore located. In order to locate the J.A. Scott No. 1 I had to reverse the calls and come from the North as its beginning corner could not be identified by natural objects and was not tied to any other survey except the North line of the T E & L Co. surveys however as Wm Hudson originally located the Atkinson, Hand, Gamble, J.A. Scott No. 3 and No. 1 I think it would be proper to work from any of his corners that could be identified as I have done.

I could not locate the beginning corner of the H. Williams survey or its SW corner but the NW corner can be located from a bearing on a mound within a few varas as far as its N & S position is concerned, The SE corner of the J. de la Garza 177 acre survey can be located by a pile of stone and a call for a branch along its South line so I ran East from its SE corner 400 varas and North 636 varas to intersect a line that would have the proper bearing on the mound, N 63° E, called for in the original notes of the H. Williams survey and established this point as its NW corner, thence I ran South 0° 13' E at 1452 crossed a ravine, original call for this was 1370 varas, at 2806 varas crossed another ravine, original call for this was 2700 varas, at

4016 varas the point of a rocky bluff, original call for this was 3800 varas, so I continued on from this point 1200 varas or a total distance of 5216 varas and established a point for the SW corner of the H. Williams survey and continuing on same course from this point at 1113.2 varas intersected the North line of the T E & L Co. surveys 152 varas West of the point heretofore located for the NE corner of survey No. 2695. I then returned to the point established as the NW corner of the H. Williams survey and ran West 400 varas to a point for the NE corner of the J. de la Garza 177 acre survey, Thence South 636 varas to a pile of stone for the SE corner of said survey, Thence West at 920 varas crossed branch as called for, at 976 varas a cluster of small chittum trees on North edge of hill bears South 120 varas, the NW corner of the A. Gallatin survey calls for these trees and while they are small this is the only place I find any growing near here, I am now following the work of Wm Howeth, its is possible that the original trees have been destroyed and others have come up in the same location which often happens, at 1574.2 varas creek, original call on this is 1525 varas at 1649.2 varas a point for the SW corner of the J. de la Garza survey being 75 varas West of the call on the creek as given in the original notes, thence North from this point at 110 varas branch as called for and in all 636 varas to a point for the NW corner of the J de la Garza 177 acre survey, I then returned to the point established as the NW corner of the H. Williams survey and ran N 0° 16' W along the East line of the J. de la Garza 1 league survey at 7150 varas the call distance for this line falls in a grove of large PO trees and the original surveyor would not likely call for a PO tree 323 varas from the corner and a mesquit tree when so many PO trees were much nearer so I continued on a total distance of 7958 varas to a point from which I found would fall in an area now covered with mesquit trees and also found a large PO tree about 40 inches in diameter bears West 323 varas, old residents in this area state that this has always or for many years been considered the witness tree for this corner its is now located in the South fence line of a public road and no marks can be found however this is also the recognized North line of the said survey and a property line, I ran West from here 2136.5 varas, Thence South 879.3 varas to intersect a line run East from a pile of stone I found at the NW corner of the W.W. Yearly survey and a distance of 3062 varas as called for in the field notes of the W.W. Yearly survey, a PO tree is called for here as the corner and two PO witness trees at this point I find a number of PO trees and stumps but not any three that will exactly fit the description, however in running South from this point you leave the PO timber at about 100 varas and enter a mesquit valley, if I had just ran the call distance for the East line of the J. de la Garza survey, then West 1938 varas, then South 790 varas as called for the corner would fall in a large mesquit valley and would not be near any PO trees, for this reason I think the East line of the J. de la Garza survey will have to have the excess shown in same. I was unable to locate any other original corners in this area and have arrived at the location of the other survey lines in the following manner, I ran South from the pile of stone found at the NW corner of the W.W. Yearly survey of 1/3 league to intersect a line run West from the NW corner of the H. Williams survey, placing the same proportional excess in each line as I found in the East line of the J. de la Garza survey as shown on attached plat, this will make the South line of the J. de la Garza survey 5161.4 varas, I then ran East from the pile of stone at the NW corner of the Yearly survey 3062 varas as stated above, thence North 3631 varas to a point for the NE corner of the Thos. Moorehead survey, Thence West 5738 varas to a point for the NW corner of the said Morehead survey, this is the beginning corner of the surveys composing the H T & B R R Co. block and were located by A.L. Shoemaker without calling for any natural objects, I then ran out the H T & B R R Co. surveys as shown on attached plat all of which are tied together or to surveys that I have located heretofore in this report.

My conclusions are from surveys made on the ground that no vacancies exist as to any of the files made with the exception of the 51 vara strip lying between the H T & B R R Co. survey No.22 and No.27, which is clearly an error in calculation of the distance along the West lines of Sections No.23 and No.24 H T & B R R Co. when the resurvey of Section No.27 was made by J.P. Earle on May 4, 1874, the original notes for this tract made by AL Shoemaker in 1872 calls to begin at the SE corner of Section No.22, Thence South 1820 varas to the SW corner of Section No.24, Thence East 882 varas, thence South 1000 varas, thence West 1958 varas to the East line of Section No.20, thence North 2820 varas to the SW corner of Section No.22, Thence East 1076 varas to the place of beginning, if the field notes to this Section had been corrected as they should have been including the 51 varas strip and leaving out the part that conflicts with Section No.20 it would only contain 635.4 acres or 4.6 acres less then it is patented for.

In addition to this I find that there is a small tract of 4.7 acres lying between the C C I Co. survey No.3 and the H T & B R R Co. surveys No.20 and No.27 that is not covered by any field notes that I have available, this tract is 127.4 varas E & W and 210.3 varas N & S.

You will note that the C C I Co. surveys No.1,2,3, 4 & 5 were located By Samuel Green and he was evidently in error as to his location of surrounding surveys as they conflict with adjoining surveys in a number of places if you run course and distance which is about the only way to locate same as it is impossible to reach the surveys called for in a number of cases.

The attached plat will enable you to follow inut the surveys as run and will be glad to furnish any other information desired if in your opinion I have not constructed the surveys in the proper manner.

Yours very truly,

Ross Corlett
 Ross Corlett

Licensed Land Surveyor.

RECEIVED

1870

RECORDED

EE
 2077
 21/12
 21/12

B³

Counter 18475

B⁴

Counter 41768

RECEIVED
MAR 6 - 1940
GENERAL LAND OFFICE

Richard W. H. H.
Rosa Collette
Comptroller

39

File No. Sk. Files
Clay County

Statement (Roll Sk #1)
Filed 3/6, 1940

BASCOM GILES, Com'r
French
File Clerk

Page # 4

the survey in the proper manner. The attached plat will enable you to follow out the information desired in your opinion I have not contemplated the same number of cases. It is impossible to reach the surveys called for in some of the cases which is shown in a number of places in the attached plat. The distance between the C O I Co. survey and the C O I Co. survey No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 is 210.3 acres N & S. I have been advised that I have available all the surveys No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 that I have available. The distance between the C O I Co. survey and the C O I Co. survey No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 is 210.3 acres N & S. I have been advised that I have available all the surveys No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 that I have available. The distance between the C O I Co. survey and the C O I Co. survey No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 is 210.3 acres N & S. I have been advised that I have available all the surveys No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 that I have available.

In addition to this I find that there is a small discrepancy in the plat between the C O I Co. survey and the C O I Co. survey No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. The distance between the C O I Co. survey and the C O I Co. survey No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 is 210.3 acres N & S. I have been advised that I have available all the surveys No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 that I have available. The distance between the C O I Co. survey and the C O I Co. survey No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 is 210.3 acres N & S. I have been advised that I have available all the surveys No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 that I have available.