

W. D. TWICHELL,  
SURVEYOR.

Texas Land ~~and~~ Boundaries a Specialty.

2108

Amarillo, Texas, Aug. 25<sup>th</sup> 1905.

Hon. John J. Terrell,  
Austin, Texas,

Dear Sir:-

Inclosed I hand you preliminary report, showing what I have been able to find on the ground in my survey of Mr. A. B. Robertson's ranch and I wish to ask special instructions from you fixing the John Walker survey, and all surveys taking their connection from their "Cobb Corner" and surveys on Spring Creek. I have a letter from Jasper Hays directed to J. T. Lofton, a correct copy of which I inclose, which indicates clearly that the stone corners that I have found were made when the lands were located. This letter indicates that the southwest corner of the Walker and the northwest corner of same were placed by Jasper Hays also the pile of stones I have found at the southeast corner of survey 1 block 24, also several of the piles of stone which I have found for the surveys on Spring Creek. The line of stone piles referred to is in block J. This line of stones being mentioned in Mr. Lofton's letter ~~from~~<sup>to</sup> Jasper Hays.

The old Gholson ranch at Gholson Spring was on survey 1 K. Aycock just west of where "794 OPS 4W" is written in 730, so the north connection referred to by Jasper Hays is the Plum Creek monument in survey 13 block B9. I have made a complete list of what I have found referring by letters to positions on the map and in this list I have tried to make the connections plain, also offering explanations in the same manner, but offering no solution. I agreed to be on the ground on the 24<sup>th</sup> inst. but was delayed by the suit against N. A. Laughlin at Hereford, which actually consumed about one week of my time and kept me from looking after this matter. I have done all I could to protect the state's interest in the Laughlin case and I am satisfied it will yet be won if proper steps are taken. I hope you may be able to take this matter up promptly and instruct me in detail as to all the surveys taking their connection from the "Cobb Corner". I describe my survey of blocks J and O in full, in the maps and lists referred to, and I hope that my construction of these blocks also my construction of block B9 and all of Mr. Robertson's land lying north of B9 meets your approval. Please advise me as to these blocks and my construction as made. The line of stone mounds from southeast of 1 to the west is very old; has been accepted locally for a long time.

W. D. TWICHELL,  
SURVEYOR.

Texas Land Boundaries a Specialty.

Amarillo, Texas.

This is also true of the line of stone running north on west side of 10 block 24 and the monument at the southwest of 13 block 24. Surveys 7 and 8 D. & S. E. on Spring Creek are well identified; you will notice the other surveys calling for Spring Creek, cannot fit their calls for surveys 7 and 8, the John Walker, and the other calls for Spring Creek. If German has correctly identified the position of 1, 2, 3 and 4 on Spring Creek, then they must have been located at a different time from the John Walker survey or surveys 7 and 8; and since Jasper Hays connected through to Plum Creek monument, it seems that his calls to cross Spring Creek are erroneous, or that he took Red Bank for Spring Creek. Notwithstanding all this there is a pile of stone on point of hill where I have shown the northeast corner of survey 2, not marked. It is claimed Jasper Hays marked all his rocks  $\bar{x}$ . There is another pile of stone at the southwest corner of survey 2 not marked, and distance 49 vs. short from the northeast corner of 2. There is another pile of stone at the southwest corner of 4 as shown, not marked and distance short 285.4 vs. Distance to Spring Creek is right on east line of 4, but northwest corner of 4 would fall in Spring Creek, and by running from these piles of stone, so identified surveys 3 and 1 are in conflict. <sup>do not connect with 7 and 8 on the John Walker</sup> And if they were placed to connect with the John Walker, and the John Walker were placed to fit the <sup>pile of stone</sup> ~~place~~ marked  $\bar{x}$  at "N", the surveys would then have the relative position indicated in the field notes and most of the difficulties would disappear. It is these details that I am most anxious to consult with you about, and I hope I have presented the complex conditions so they can be fully understood.

Yours respectfully

W. D. Twichell  
State Surveyor

I will be able to send blue print showing north part of Mr Robertsons Ranch tomorrow "if it dont rain"  
W.D.T.

List of corners, south part of Robertson's work.

Amarillo, Texas.

- A:- southeast cor. 1239, "Cob Corner" a large pile of stone, very old; "oblong peak" bears S  $4^{\circ} 6'$  E (this is the sharp rocky point on west side of butte), east end of same butte bears S  $21^{\circ} 28' 10''$  E. These bearings record angle from the line connecting the "Cob Corner" and the "Bottle Corner", true course of this connection S  $89^{\circ} 10'$  E 5 miles 763.6 varas.
- A1:- northeast cor. 5 block A, pile of stone at foot of hill on north side, ~~xxxxx~~ 782 varas S  $89^{\circ} 10'$  E from "Cob Corner" and 3.7 varas north of line
- A2:- very old pile of stone on hill, with broken black bottle in mound, same being known as the "Bottle Corner". "Cob Corner" bears N  $89^{\circ} 10'$  W 5 miles 763.6 varas, whence sharp peak at east end of plains bears S  $24^{\circ} 40' 1''$  W true angle from line to "Cob Corner", true bearing of peak S  $25^{\circ} 33' 1''$  W from meridian passing through "Bottle Corner"
- B:- Stake and pile of stones, set by Twichell 1901 varas N  $0^{\circ} 50'$  E from "Cob Corner".
- B1:- A stone 18x12x2 marked 4-702-1301 set by Twichell 3802 varas N  $0^{\circ} 50'$  W X from "Cob Corner", whence German's cypress stake bears N 9.7 and W 22.9 and German's pile of stone (three small stone) bears N  $0^{\circ} 50'$  E 611.5 and west 286 varas
- B2:- A stone 18x20x2 marked 1301-1302 set by Twichell on north bank of Sandy Creek, 3 miles N  $0^{\circ} 50'$  W from "Cobb Corner"; a stone 20x12x5 marked 1305-721 set by Twichell bears N  $0^{\circ} 50'$  E 566 varas.
- C: A stone 18x16x2 marked 1301-1302-1303-1304-X set by Twichell S  $89^{\circ} 10'$  E 1901 varas from B2, whence a mesquite limb marked X bears west 5.5 varas.
- C1:- Stone 18x18x2 marked 707-703-1303-1304 set by Twichell S  $89^{\circ} 10'$  E 1901 varas from C, whence -a
- C2:- stone 24x12x2 marked 703-705-706-707, whence red peak bears (angle from line) S  $63^{\circ} 57'$  W about 300 varas, set by Twichell.
- C 3:- point in bed of river, whence a stone 20x16x2 marked 705-708-15-16 (set by Twichell) bears N  $89^{\circ} 10'$  W 51 varas, and X on natural rock at point of bluff bears S  $89^{\circ} 10'$  E 500 varas.
- C4:- stone 20x16x3 marked 15-16-18-3 (set by Twichell) course and distance from "Cob Corner" perpendicular and parallel to base from "Cob Corner" to "Bottle Corner", whence three old stone and stone set by Twichell marked SW2-KA bears S  $89^{\circ} 10'$  E 1325.6 varas and N  $0^{\circ} 50'$  E ~~xxxxxx~~ 186 varas. (This southwest corner of 2 Kay A Cock has been adopted in the land office with Watt's work)

Amarillo, Texas.

D:-stone 20x16x2 marked 13-4-707 set by Twichell for northeast corner of 1304 (C. & D. from Cobb) whence large pile of flat stone, very old, bears N  $79^{\circ} 25' 50''$  W 125.4 varas = north 22.6 and west 122.9 varas. (This corner has been accepted by local surveyors as the southeast corner of the John Walker); from D a round knoll bears S  $77^{\circ} 1' 30''$  W about one half mile; point of bluff on south bank of river bears N  $70^{\circ} 36' 30''$  E about one mile; do bears N  $53^{\circ} 18'$  E about three fourths of a mile; J. W. James house bears N  $22^{\circ} 10'$  E; (bearings give angle from line, Mag.  $11^{\circ} 5'$  E).

E:-stone 16x12x2 marked 721-1302-JW set by Twichell four miles N  $0^{\circ} 50'$  E from "Cobb Corner", loose sand stone at abandoned fence corner bears north 235.5 and west 162.7 vs. German's cypress peg bears west 68.9 and south 5.5 vs. a draw bears east 282 vs. a very old pile of stone marked  $\bar{x}$ , claimed to be the original southwest corner of the Jno. Walker bears N  $0^{\circ} 50'$  W  $\frac{269.5}{134.5}$  vs. and west 61 vs. Everything about this corner indicates it is the original southwest of the John Walker. Jasper Hays letter indicates he placed it there. Head of a slight drain running northeast bears north 430 vs. from the old stone corner marked  $\bar{x}$  and Lockwood Draw bears north 942 vs. The old piles of stone, which have been taken for the southeast corner of the John Walker, do not fit course and distance from this ~~ste~~ old corner, nor do they fit course and distance from any thing else, they are not marked but are very old.

E1:- stone 18x16x2 marked 721-722, set by Twichell, <sup>1893.2 vs</sup> ~~one mile~~ east of stones found at southwest of 722, said stone being 61.2 vs. west of red line on map, same being 4 miles and 632.5 vs. N  $24^{\circ} 30''$  E from "Cobb Corner".

E2:-stone 20x14x2 marked 722-JH, set by Twichell, 5 miles and 566 vs. N  $0^{\circ} 50'$  E from "Cobb Corner".

E3:-stone set in ground by Twichell, whence a very old rock monument bears south 14.6 and east 77.8 vs. and two small stones, probably placed by Holt bear north 16 and west 55.3 vs.; and German's pile of stone bears south 16.5 and west 89 vs. and a stone set course and distance from Plum Creek monument at point one mile south of southwest 18 Block B9, bears N  $0^{\circ} 50'$  E 641 and east 65 varas.

Amarillo, Texas.

- F:-old pile of stone, probably placed by Holt, 1548.5 vs. south and 3 vs. west from southwest of 18, whence an old stone mound in road, German's southwest corner of 2, D. & S. E. bears north 282 and east 9.5 vs.
- G:-old pile of stone, said by Hughes to be German's southwest corner of 4, E. L. & R. R. set stone 20x15x2, whence German's southeast 4 bears N 89° 6' E 1615.5 vs.
- G1:-stone 16x14x2 marked SE-5, whence German's southwest 4 bears south 1244 vs.
- G2:- stone 14x26x2 marked NW-4, set by Twichell in Spring Creek, 1901 vs. north from southwest 4.
- H:-stone 20x10x4 marked L\*~~T~~\*R\*~~I~~ L5-4-8, set by Twichell in old pile of stone, on natural mound ten feet high, the original southeast corner of survey 8 D. & S. E. same being 518.6 vs. south and 996.2 vs. west from stone set in Spring Creek.
- H1:-a very old pile of stone, set stone 18x16x4 marked 8-4 in P. S. same being 1900 vs. west and 16.9 vs. north of the southeast of 8'
- I:-stone 18x12x2 marked 3-4 set 69 vs. north from southwest 8.
- I1:-setbstone 20x14x2 marked 7-8 and two stones, 950 vs. north and 5.7 vs. east from southwest corner of 8.
- I2:-set stone marked 7 in very old pile of stones, the northwest corner of survey 7 block D. & S. E. same being 1900 vs. north and 11.6 vs. east from the southwest corner of survey 8.
- J:-stone 22x6x4 marked X in drain, 7 vs. <sup>East</sup> East of road set by Twichell 707 for southwest east and 86 vs. south from the northwest corner of 7, ~~in-the-west-line~~ of 730, whence a stone 14x14x2 set in north line of 7 D. & S. E. bears North 82.3 vs.
- K:-stone set 831 vs. south and 5 vs. west (by Twichell) from southeast of 8 for southwest of 5 I. & G. N. constructed from 7 and 8 D. & S. E.
- L:-pile of stone by German, with proper mesquits bearing for southwest of 1 Thos. Hughes, same being 1539 vs. N 89° 10' W and 30 vs south of Twichell's stone at the northwest of Walker, =E3.
- L1:-a very old pile of stone (set stone 24x18x5) same being 1961 vs. N 89° 10' W and 152 vs. south of northwest of John Walker, E 3, an old pile of stone bears north 216 and west 116.5 vs.

Amarillo, Texas.

- L2:-a very old stone monument, marked X on top, under side of stonemarked NW-723-SE 1 & H. E. & W. T. marks old enough to be original, set stone 24x18x1 marked SE1-NW723, an old pile of stone on hill bears west 111 and north 95 vs. This old pile of stone is N  $89^{\circ} 10'$  W from northwest of John Walker (E3) 3895 vs. and south 77 vs.  $\frac{3875}{107}$   $\frac{77}{33}$   $\frac{44}{288}$   $\frac{332}{49}$
- M:-stone 16x3x2 marked NW722, set 1300 vs. south  $0^{\circ} 50'$  west from "L1" whence a stone 16x16x2 marked S E 723 (set by Twichell) bears S  $50^{\circ} W$  600 vs. loose stones at N. W. corner of field bear south 481 and west 12.5 vs.
- M1:-two stones, claimed to be original southwest 722 by Lockwood, set stone 24x14x1 marked 721-722-same being 1999 vs. S  $0^{\circ} 50'$  W and 4.8 vs. east of "M",
- M2:-stone 14x24x5 marked S W 721, set 1803 vs. S  $0^{\circ} 50'$  W and 4.8 vs west from "M1"
- M3:-pile of stone made for southwest 1036, same being 1550 vs. south  $50'$  west and 1900 vs N  $89^{\circ} 10'$  W of "M2".
- N:-very old piles of stone, marked very old "T" on top, another stone marked  $\bar{x}$ , very old, claimed as the original southwest corner of the Walker whence head of a slight drain running northeast bears north 430 vs. and Lockwood Draw bears north ~~432~~ 942 vs. Everything about this corner indicates that it is the original southwest of the Jno. Walker. "E1" bears N  $0^{\circ} 50'$  E 364 vs. and loose stone at corner of abandoned fence bears N  $89^{\circ} 10'$  W 102.5 and N  $0^{\circ} 50'$  E 16.9 vs.
- N1:-set stone 14x12x2
- N2:-set stone 24x18x2, whence old rock monument bears south 243.75 and west 111 vs. (50 vs. error)
- N3:-stake set in river bed, preliminary NW 645.  
18x20x2 marked X
- O1:-stone on south slope of hill, same being 1504 east S  $89^{\circ} 10'$  E and 235 S  $0^{\circ} 50'$  W from "O". Goodwin's pile of stone, at head of draw, bears south about 20 and east about 35 vs. = Goodwin's northeast 645.
- O2:-stone 16x16x3 marked X, set 1900 vs. S  $89^{\circ} 10'$  E from "O", set stone 16x14x2 at point S  $50'$  W 235 vs.
- P:- set stone 18x12x2 marked NEJW, whence south 20 B9, bears N  $50'$  E 679 and west 95.4 vs. a pile of stone bears south 15 and east 1 vs. and large rock monument of large sand rock, bears S  $50'$  W 277.5 vs. and N  $89^{\circ} 10'$  W 244.7 vs.

W. D. TWICHELL,  
SURVEYOR.

Texas Land Boundaries a Specialty.

(5)

Amarillo, Texas.

- P1:-stone 14x24x4 marked S E 20 B9-1KA and large pile of stone, whence a stone set in ground (2x12x12 above ground) marked SE20 bears west 38 and south 21 vs. and a large fine sand stone in ground, marked S W20 KX (Kays corner) bears south 90 and east 85 vs. stone set by Twichell 18x12x5, marked WSW-1KA bears west 139 vs. (from this stone a rock ledge - pour over-in draw, bears north 29vs.
- Q:-stone 18x14x1 set by Twichell for southwest corner of 20, course and distance from Plum Creek monument, whence German's southwest of 20 a conglomerate stone and three stones, identified by Hughes, bears east 153.5 and south 91 vs. a stake set in the mouth of Red Bank Creek bears north 571 and west 35.5 vs. and an old pile of stone on point of hill, set stone 14x18x2 marked 1-2, bears north 1520.9 and west 35.5vs.
- Q1:-a stake in river bears east 50 vs. do bears west 35.5 vs. a pile of stone on hill bears east about 300 vs. and a pile of stone west point of hill bears north 99.4 and east 50 vs.
- R:-stone 18x12x2 marked 15-16-17-1 set by Twichell course and distance from Plum Creek monument, on gravel slope of bluff; pile of stone on top point of bluff bears north, do. bears south; an old pile of stone (probably Marshall's southwest 1) bears south 28 and east 2 vs.
- \* R1:-stone 18x12x2 marked 1-2-14-15, set course and distance from Plum  
\* Creek monument, (cor. 1.6 W & 1 N)
- S:-set stone 24x12x4 marked SW 732, whence Holt's pile of stone bears south east 69 and east 48 vs.
- R2:-stone 20x16x2 marked 16-17-18, set course and distance from Plum Creek monument.
- R3:- stone 16x12x2 marked SW 18, in bed of Spring Creek, whence <sup>witness</sup> bearing stone bears south 50 vs.
- R4:-stone 21x14x3 on hill, same being 1901 vs. south of southwest of 18 block B9.
- S:- set stone 24x12x4 marked SW 732, ~~set course and distance~~ whence Holt's pile of stone bears south 69 and east 48 vs.
- S1:-three stones very old, on old Iowa fence line (abandoned) accepted by local surveyors as the northwest corner of 6 Block 24, set stone 18x8x5 marked 6-11.

Amarillo, Texas.

S2:-three old stones on old Iowa fence line (abandoned) set stone 18x16x4 marked 6-11-9-12.

S3:-very old pile of stones on old Iowa fence line (abandoned) set stone 16x14x4 marked 9-12-13, same being 1901.1 S 0° 34' 40" E from "S2"

✓ S4:-very large old pile of stone, set stone 14x12x2 marked 1272-14-13.

T:-very old pile of stone = one large stone and several small stones, accepted by local surveyors as the southeast corner of survey 12, set stone 10x12x2 marked 11\*8 12 (improvements in blocks J, L, and O, have been adjusted to this corner and corners to west viz: T1, T2, T4 and U3 as original stones, by so placing these lands the northeast corner of survey 1 block J falls 367 vs. north and 419 vs. east from absolute course and distance from southwest Lg. 3 San Augustine, when placed at absolute course and distance from northwest of 141 block 2). This small difference on such a long connection, traced with a compass, from northwest 141, across a district where the magnetic is subject to great abnormal changes, is remarkably close. In fact a compass run from 141 to the northeast of survey 1 block J, at this date, will not place the northeast corner of 1 so near its true position. Since no corners (original) can be found in the true position, or in any other position, except the one indicated by these old corners, I have accepted them as original corners and surveyed blocks J and O accordingly.

T1:-an old stone 14x14x5 and possible pit 1.5 vs. east, set stone in ground marked (old corners at T, T1 and T2 are in a direct line which extended falls 20.9 vs. north of old corner at southeast of 2 block J)

T2:-old stone 12x12x8 above ground and possible pit one vara west, marked stone in old corner.

T3:-set stone 12x6x6 marked 5-6-7-8, due west of southeast of 12, whence old fence corner (abandoned) bears east 3.5 and south 13 vs.

T4:-old stone in ground and several small stones, set stone 12x8x2 marked 2-4-5-6.

U:-set stone 22x12x2 marked 5-5-7-8, whence southeast of 5 block J bears true south 1900 vs.

U1:-set stone 18x12x3 marked 5-5-4-2, whence three small stone (Holt's) bear west 9.5 and south 1.2 vs.



W. D. TWICHELL,  
SURVEYOR.

Texas Land Boundaries a Specialty.

(7)

Amarillo, Texas.

- U2:-set stone 18x12x3 marked 1-1-4-2, for northeast of § 1 block J  
(this stone stands 367 vs. north and 419 vs. east from the absolute  
course and distance as called, through San Augustine Co. school land,  
back to the northwest corner of 141 block 2. For fuller explanation  
see "T")
- U3:-an old stone 11x8x5 and one pit, accepted as original northwest corner  
of 1 block J; set stone 22x14x2 marked 1-1-X, whence 2" cedar stake and  
6ft. circular trench (about three years old) bears south 11.4 and  
west 33.8 vs. and corner of fence bears south 52 and west 32.7 vs.
- V:- set stone 20x18x2 marked 1-3, whence fence bears east 7 vs.
- V1:- set stone 14x12x4 marked 3-19, whence fence brs east 31.7 vs.
- V2:-set stone 22x10x2 marked 19-20 whence corner of fence bears south  
26.3 and east 58.3 vs. and northwest corner of 1 block J bears due  
north three miles.
- (Local surveyors have attempted to construct the west part of block J  
perpendicular to a base passing from the southwest corner of 9 T4,  
which is considerably to the left of the base from southeast corner of  
12 to the southeast corner of 9, and is also farther from true course.  
It is evident that the surveyor is attempting to run due west from the  
southeast corner of 12 to the southwest corner of 5 and on to the north-  
west corner of 1. I have therefore conformed to the original corners  
running all north and south lines true course, and all east and west  
lines true course from the west line of survey 7 east, and I have  
placed the east and west line from west line of survey 7 west, on  
oblique courses to conform to the southwest corner of 5 and the north-  
west corner of survey 1.) Local surveyors constructing from two bases  
cause surveys to contract north an going south, and expand going north.
- W:-set stone 18x10x2 marked 18-19-20-1 .
- W1:- set stone 16x14x2 marked 17-18-1-2.
- W2:-set stone 16x10x2 marked 6-4-17-18.
- W3:- set stone 16x12x2 marked 17-18-7-2.
- W4:-set stone 22x6x2 marked 7-8-14-15, whence Standfer's peg and small  
stone bears west 11.2 and north 4.2 vs.
- X:-set stone 16x12x4 marked 7-4-2-3, whence pile of small stones bear  
east 58 and south 3 vs.

(8)

Amarillo, Texas.

- X1:-set stone 18x14x2 marked 7-4-11-15, whence Standfer's cedarvstake bears north 3.5 vs.
- X2:- set stone 12x12x2 marked 15-16-18-11 whence Holt's stake and four pits bear east 25.8 and south 9 vs. (Mr. Embry holds letters from Hon. John J. Terrell, showing my working sketch erroneous, as to superiority of surs.)
- X3:-set stone 10x8x2 whence a fence bears west 5.1 vs. and Standifer's stake and two pits bear west 5.1 and north 2.5 vs. Please give me correct data as to superiority of surveys.
- X4:-set stone 12x10x8 marked 16-15-13-14 whence Holt's stake and four pits bear east 14 and south 8.9 vs. Fence bears east 14.7 vs.
- X5:- set stone 18x12x2 marked 10-11-13-14, whence fence bears east 3.3 vs.
- X6:-set stone 22x8x4, whence LLano fence bears west 2 vs.
- Y:- set stone 12x12x4, whence pile of stone bears east 10 and south 1 v.
- Y1:- set stone 10x12x6 marked 9-12-9
- Y2:-setstone 18x14x2 marked 9-10
- Y3:-set stone 16x14x2 marked NE10
- Y4:- set stone 7x14x3 marked 7-10
- Y5:- set stone 16x12x4 marked 7-6
- Y6:- set stone 20x20x3 marked 6-3
- Y7:-set stone 16x8x2 marked 2-3 under fence, whence stone in ground bears west 22.5 and north 3.5 vs. fence corner bears west 26 vs.
- Y8:-set stone 14x8x2 marked 1-2-3-4, whence a stone in ground bears north 4.8 and west 8.5 vs.
- Y9:- set stone 24x14x3 marked 1-2, whence stone in ground bears south 7 and west 6 vs. and stake and circular trench (small about three years oldx bears south 11 and west 40.7 vs. (from which corner of fence bears north 4 vs.)
- Y10:-set stone 14x12x2 marked 3-4-5-6, whence southwest 5 block 0 bears south 1900 vs.
- Z:-set stone 12x6x2 marked N13, whence a lrange stone and pile of small stones, on old fence line bears north 6.6 vs.
- Z1:-set stone 10x8x3 marked 7-10, whence a very old pile of stone, a large stone marked X bears west 2.3 and north 3 vs. on old fence line.
- (Courses and distances connecting the old corners are shown on map.
- Twichell's stones are set one mile apart on a line surveyed : ~~723~~
- N 89° 45' E. The stones on this line evidently have been accepted as the true south line of block 24 for many years and the southeast corner of 1 has every appearance of being the original stone mound called for in field notes of 723.)

(9)

Amarillo, Texas.

- Z2:-set stone 12x8x1 marked 7-2, whence old pile of stone at corner of fence bears north 10.4 and west 1 vs.
- Z3:-set stone 12x12x2 marked 2-1, whence very old pile of stone bears north 10 vs. (Twichell's preliminary line extended falls 14 vs. south of L2, and if this line is accepted by the land office, as the south line of block 24, stones set by Twichell should be corrected to the old corners. Special instructions upon this point are requested from the commissioner.)
- a1:-an old stone set in ground, the northeast (original) corner of the E. B. Logan, whence the northwest corner of 812 bears north 6.5 and east 18.9 vs.
- a:-set stone 12x12x2 marked WMR-22, whence a stone 14x12x4 marked 9-10 L22 bears west 582 vs.
- a2:-old pile of stone, original northwest corner of E. B. Logan, whence the northeast corner of 1036 bears north 8.7 and west 29.4 vs.
- a3:-no corner
- a4:-an old stone mound the northwest corner of the E. B. Logan, whence a north corner of 5 K. Aycock bears south 126.8 and west 4 vs.
- a5:-old pile of stones, southwest of E. B. Logan, three large stone (Twichell corner) for reentrant corner of 5, bears south 14.5 and east Southeast corner of 1036 bears south 60.2 and east 263 vs.
- a6:-stone 24x14x3 marked 5 (Twichell's northeast corner of K. Aycock) whence a stone 12x10x2 marked 9-812 bears south 52 vs.
- a7:-stone 16x10x2 marked X, whence a stone 14x12x3 marked 1041 bears west 44 vs.
- a8:-stone 6x8x1 marked 1040-1037 and a stone 14x10x2 marked X.
- a9:-stone 6x8x1 marked WMR and a stone 14x12x2 marked X whence a stone 18x16x2 marked 1035-11 bears south 693 vs. and a pile of stone by Orand bears north 23 and east 140 vs. and a pile of stone by Holt bears south 95 and east 243.
- b:-set stone 16x12x4 marked EL4 bears north 7 vs. (from southwest vacancy)
- b1:-set stone 13x13x2 marked 3-4
- b2:- set stone 12x12x2 marked NE3
- b3: set stone 14x10x5 marked NW811
- b4:- set stone 14x10x5 marked 811-812, between water holes, whence Wheelm wind mill bears N 86° 14'40" E and fence bears east 35 vs. and old stone in ground (the northeast of E. B. Logan) bears S 70° 45' W 20 vs.

Amarillo, Texas.

b5:-stone in ground on north slope of bluff, the NNW5 K. Aycock, whence the southeast corner of survey 1036 bears south 45.7 vs. ~~B6~~

b6:- set stone 16x20x2 marked SE1036, whence butte "A" bears N ~~54~~ 48° 34' 30" W to N 54° 33' W; butte "B" bears S 65° 35' W to S 68° 23' W; Wheeler's windmill bears N 55° 57' W, (on section 1040). John K. Fullingim's windmill bears N 4° 54' W; and NNW 5 a stone on north slope of bluff bears north 45.7 vs.

b7:-stone set in ground marked SW4 .

Garza Co. A. K. F. I. d.  
Crosby Co. 76 # 18

Mr. W. D. Twichell  
Amarillo, Tex.

Dear Sir:- Your letter of the 25<sup>th</sup> inst enclosing  
plat of surveys surrounding the John Walker  
League in northern part of Garza county  
and copy of Jasper May's letter attached  
has been received. After giving a careful study of  
study to your report in connection with the above  
plat I have concluded that owing to evident  
inconsistencies between the field notes recorded in  
this office and evidences of corners on the ground,  
I can not give any instructions as to the con-  
struction of those surveys shown. You will  
have to be guided by the working sketch you  
have, calls of original field notes, and evidences  
of original corners that you have been able  
to find. Without a better understanding of  
conditions that obtain on the ground I can  
not venture to give detailed instructions  
and will have to leave the construction to you.

8-31-05

W. D. Twichell