

1007  
368

1009  
694

904

RECEIVED

NOV 7 1910

Referred to Map

Northfield, Tex., 11/2/10.

Hon. J. T. Robinson, Commissioner,  
Gen. Land Office, Austin, Tex.

Dear Sir: I would be pleased to  
submit the following for your  
consideration.

I am now engaged, and have  
been for more than two months  
determining the locations of the  
lands owned by the "Continental  
Land & Cattle Company - W. E.  
Hughs of St. Louis, Mo. being the  
personal owner of most of them).  
The lands in question are located  
in Hall, Motley, Cottle, Briscoe  
and Childress Counties, and comprise  
nearly 300000 Acres E'  
counter 22797

Hon. J. T. R. 2

E<sup>2</sup>

I have run all the long connecting lines and connected "backs" to check the work. We are doing this work in a scientific way and with extreme care, placing six corners which are not checked by closing the survey or by other means.

The owner of these lands wishes this work made permanent, by filing maps and field notes of it in your office and in the offices of the Surveyors of the various Counties.

We wish to do all this work, both office and field, under advisement with yourself, and under instructions



from your office.

The owner of these lands wishes this done and is willing and ready to meet all the attendant expenses. He would be glad to furnish you any information you may desire, run any lines or do any other work that you may advise.

We are doing this work with the various County Surveyors so that all notes, sketches, and maps may be made official by proper signatures:

I have been familiar with much of <sup>the</sup> locations in question for a period extending over more than 20 years.

I would therefore respectfully ask

Hon. J. T. R. Page 4

E<sup>4</sup>

for appointment of State Surveyor by yourself.

The owner of these lands desires this and would earnestly solicit you to make the appointment. The address is: 710 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.

I believe that the owners of the lands contiguous to the lands in question would accept the work, without protest, if done by a State Surveyor and under instructions from yourself. In fact many have already agreed to this.

I would state further that: Mr. Ernest Von Rosenberg and Mr. Horncutt, of your office know something of me.

I am hoping to hear from you at earliest convenience.

Respectfully yours,  
Geo. H. Chipman

Northfield Tex  
(in field) County 22750



Childress, Texas, Sept. 10, 1913.

Mr. Ernest von. Rosenberg,

Austin, Texas.

Dear Mr. von. Rosenberg:

I would hereby acknowledge the receipt of your sketch and note<sup>b</sup> what you request thereon relative Survey, No. 65 in Block 3, T. and P. R. R. Co.

I would say in reply that we built Surveys, Nos. 62, 61, 60, 65, 66, 67, 68 etc. from Survey, No. 51, said Block 3, preserving the integrity of this part of the Block.

The Surveys, Nos. 50, 63 and 61, in said Block 3, located on the river do not bear the same relation to each other, in our re-survey as they do when located per the Original Field Notes. This difference is due to the fact that the Original Field Notes do not locate the natural river.

I do not have the field notes of the Surveys of this Block before me at this writing; but as I remember Survey, No. 51, is located by the Original Field Notes two miles north of the river survey, No. 50. Building the various surveys of this part of the block from said Survey, No. 51, consecutively, per the Original Field Notes to and including said Survey, No. 65, then this latter survey will fall 3568.2 vs. N. of Survey, No. 64.

It is quite possible that we should have placed the S. E. Cr. of said Survey, No. 65, two miles north of the N. E. Cr. of Survey, No. 64. This adjustment would, however, disrupt this part of the block, and you could not place the N. W. Cr. of Survey, No. 71, from the N. E. Cr. of Survey, No. 70, as called in the Original Field Notes. Therefore if you place said Survey, No. 65, as per the Original Field Notes we must abandon these notes in locating some eight or ten surveys in this part of the block. My judgment is that we should relocate all these surveys in question from said Survey, No. 51, allowing Surveys, Nos. 62, and 65, to fall as they may. I may, of course, be in error in this.

I have done no work in this immediate vicinity but compiled my map in this vicinity from my connecting line. I understand, however, that the County Surveyor of Briscoe County has lately made a resurvey of this Block 3, placing all the corners. He based his work upon the location of the river surveys, as made by me. I do not know how he placed said Survey, No. 65, if he has located this part of the block<sup>as</sup> shown upon the Chipman map, would there be anything gained by making a change? On the other hand, if he has placed Surveys, Nos. 51, 62 and 65, as per the Original Field Notes each two miles north of its corresponding survey on the river, then would there be anything gained by making a change now?

You may adhere to the Original Field Notes in locating said Survey, No. 51, if, however, you do so then you must abandon said notes in making a relocation of several other surveys in this part of the block.

I understand that we were obliged to ignore the calls of the Original Field Notes in most of the other parts of this block. The trouble is all caused by the change we made along the river. For illustration I would call your attention to the S. E. Cr. of Survey, No. 4, this Block, 3. We find it 578 vs. south of the river when located by the Original Field Notes. When corrected to the natural object, the river, we have four surveys, one to four, inc., each of which are 1755.5 vs. on its meridian boundaries.

If convenient I would be pleased to learn how you decide to place said Survey, No. 65, on your map.

Very truly yours,

*Geo. H. Chipman was  
killed Dec 31/1913 by his  
son-in-law Dr. Richardson*



17.

Geo H Chipman's letter to  
Mr E. von Rosenberg.

Sep 10, 1913.

Floyd Co

Counter 22752