

1 The State of Texas }
2 County of Fort Bend }

3 To the Hon. H. J. Baker
4 Com^r Gen^l Land Office
5 Austin, Texas.

6 Hon. Sir

7 Having been called upon by Mr. R. T.
8 Mulcahy, who is the owner of Survey II, by Cert. No 699
9 I & G. N. Ry. Co. a 200 Acre survey which has been
10 placed in Conflict by a resurvey made by James
11 F. Weed acting as Deputy State Surveyor of Section
12 No 10. A & T. C. Ry. Co. Surveyed by Cert. 85 in Fort
13 Bend County.

14 I most respectfully submit the accompanying
15 Sketches and report to your office; together with an
16 Explanation of facts; and of the lines of the original
17 Survey of Sections 1 to 12. Block 1 as original surveyed
18 upon the ground by Stephen Archer on Jan. 18 & 19th
19 1867 and the Resurvey of same by the aforesaid James
20 F. Weed Jan. 1890.

21 The lines in black represent the A & T. C. Surveys
22 and Original Mexican Grants i - e - Asa
23 Wickson 1/4 League, C. B. Stuart 1/4 Leag. Angus
24 J. James 1/4 Leag. Jesse Thompson labor and Geo.
25 S. Pentecost labor, the James Hughes 1/2 Leag. Pat.
26 Survey in 41 and the Wm Leech 1286 acre Survey
27 Cert. ⁴¹⁵⁸/₄₂₅₉ as surveyed by Stephen Archer the original
28 Deputy Surveyor of Fort Bend Co. - And the dotted
29 in red showing the surveys as resurveyed by James
30 F. Weed Dept. State Surveyor in Jan. 1890; which
31 resurvey does not place the aforesaid A & T. C.
32 Surveys on the same ground, that they were originally

surveyed by 648½ varas as will be seen by Sketch at North Corner of W^m Leech Survey and its connection with the East Corner of Section 1 - which is the beginning of these Surveys.

Which you will readily see has been moved. Also you will see on Sketch the same difference at the Common Corner of Sections 1, 2, 3 & 5.

1st This is all prairie totally void of timber or brush except small skirts of timber on Creek banks, which is very scattering and none exceeds 20 to 25 varas from its banks, as is represented on Sketch, which Creeks are carefully located on same exactly as they run upon the ground.

You will also notice two old time roads leading from Richmond: One to Snake Creek settlement, the other to Matagorda, these also are properly located on Sketch, and are the only roads existing in that locality or leading to these places, except New County roads, which are fenced and not more than 3 years existing.

Next On Examination of original notes of Section 1 Cort. 176 you will note that the Surveyor gives two bearing trees to the North Corner of the W^m Leech survey and the East or Beginning Corner of said Section 1. - one a Cottonwood bearing S 33° W 68 varas distant; the other a Pin Oak bearing S 21° W - ". This would place the East or beginning Corner of Sec. 1 - also North Cor. of Leech as surveyed Jan. 18 - 1867 by original survey within 68 varas of timber and Cottonwood Creek (sometimes called West prong of Big Creek) Mr. J. F. Wood by his resurvey Jan. - 1890 has placed this Corner 416 varas from either, and where timber never existed

3

in a large prairie.

You will also note that its second call places its West Corner on the opposite side or S. W. side of Cottonwood Creek (West Prong) While J. F. Weed's resurvey places this same corner which is the Common Corner of 1, 2, 3 & 5, on the opposite or N. E. side of Cottonwood 648 1/2 varas N 13° 10' E and ^{is} in open prairie where timber never stood, by referring to original notes of Section 2 Cert. 176 and Sec. 5 Cert. 183, you will find that they both give bearing at this Common Corner. Sect. 2 Notes give a Pin Oak 2 ft. bearing N 67° E 69 varas and a Pin Oak N 8 1/2° W 50 varas distance; Sec - 5 gives the same bearings and marks (m x x) except it calls one of this trees a Pecan (undoubtedly error in writing as bearing and distances are identical) This without doubt places this Common Corner of 1, 2, 3 & 5, on the South West side of both Creek and Timber, as it would be impossible to get bearing trees except in the direction of the Creek - You will further note in notes of Section 2 that the Surveyor calls to cross this Creek at points distant apart as follows:
His 2nd Crossing is 151 varas from his 1st Crossing
His 3rd Crossing is 241 varas from his 1st Crossing and
His last Crossing is 690 varas from his 1st Crossing.
I find but one place on this Creek or prairie where this could be done, and that is as shown on Sketch N^o 2 = 344 varas S 45° W from where Surveyor J. F. Weed has placed this line as appears on Sketch N^o 2 made on a scale of 300 varas per inch to make a proper display of small measures, on this you will see, that he touches or crosses in three acute bends of Creek and crosses once between

Two bends.

I measured from this Common Corner of 1, 2, 3 & 5. $N 45^{\circ} E$ $61\frac{1}{2}$ varas and set Coupas $N 45^{\circ} W$ and it cleared all points of both Creek and timber, leaving wrought but prairie on right of sight line parallel to and $61\frac{1}{2}$ varas from original line between 2 and 5. I then measured 80 varas in opposite direction from Corner and set Coupas at same angle and it passed to the left of all timber and Creek until it crosses Creek about 900 varas distant. I then set Stake for this Common Corner 209 varas from first Crossing of Creek and measured $S 45^{\circ} W$ 1500 varas. Thence $N 45^{\circ} W$ - at 1900 varas touched 1st bank of Cottonwood Creek (or West Prong) and at 4 varas were making 1904 in all the Center of Creek.

My purpose in this was to test the original notes of 5 - which in their last or 4th Call; call to cross this Creek at 400 varas, and I found them to be correct - Here I took Coupas bearing of Creek which bears $S 75^{\circ} W$ 100 varas and then turns to the right and bears $N 58^{\circ} E$ then turns to the right as shown on Sketch No 2 - This practically makes it impossible to have crossed it at any other point. I found Surveyor Weed's S. W. line of 5 - $S 75^{\circ} W$ 70 varas from this point of Crossing, and by his Resurvey he places the West Corner of Sect. 5 505 varas $N 45^{\circ} W$ from Creek, while the original Survey places it $S 45^{\circ} W$ 400 varas from Creek and on opposite side:

From point $S 45^{\circ} E$ 209 varas first Call to cross Cottonwood (or West Prong) on S. W. line of Sec. 2 - I took angle of Creek which runs due East

5

400 varas. Thence North 40° East 500 varas, which shows the incorrect location upon the ground of these surveys as resurveyed by J. F. Weed as Deputy State Surveyor.

The original calls in Section 15. calls to cross the Snake Creek road at a point 300 varas S 45° E from where Original Surveyor placed the West Corner of Wm Leech Survey, also places Matagorda road at a point 300 varas N 45° W these I did not test by measure but went to these points in buggy and judge them to be about as represented on Sketch No 1 - also took note of 400 varas call in original notes of 10 on N.E. line of Leech, which is about as represented on Sketch No 1. Also Crossing of Creek on S.E. & N.E. lines of 10 - which indicate that both Surveyors have used the same S. W. line of Jesse Thompson labor & James Hughes - but that original Survey extended farther S. W. of these lines than resurvey, as Original notes of 10 on its S.E. end line is 1300 varas, while Surveyor J. F. Weed cuts it down to 958 and shows its N.E. line 342 varas N 45° E from the West Corner of Thompson labor. - This has caused the Conflict between 10 and J & G. N. - Survey D.

" I find two marked lines between the Wm Leech and Angus J. James 1/4 league Grant - one where you see the red dotted line run by J. F. Weed State Surveyor for the A & T. C. Ry. Co. - and the other where the black line represents the original Survey between Section 1 and 10.

I only surveyed and investigated the points and lines mentioned, as Mr Mulcahy only

wished an examination of facts and lines to place with your office.

The father of Mr. Mulcahy once owned the N.W. half of the J.A. James 1/4 League 27 years ago and he was raised then being a man now 43 years of age. He assures me that the black lines and Ketch was claimed by him as his boundary line, and that the survey made by J. F. Need ran back of the House and all improvements and places them on the Leech Survey and that they were built 50 years ago.

S. M. Farr former County Surveyor of this County who is familiar with all the lines in it; also tells me, that this used to be recognized as the correct line, you will note on Sketch the Location of Mulcahy's House, and improvements.

If you will lay this Sketch along side of State Surveyors J. F. Need's Sketch filed in your office May 10th 1890 you will readily see that Cottonwood Creek does not touch Sections 2 or 6 at all, and that he places South Corner of 6 - N.E. of Creek and Common Corner of 1, 2, 3 & 5. 1/2 mile N.E. where it should be S. W. of Cottonwood and Cottonwood should cross and recross line between 2 and 5. instead of being 3/4 mile S. W. of that line as is shown on his Sketch and as he has placed it upon the ground.

Dated, Dec. 12th 1895

Most Respectfully
H. J. Walger

County Surveyor of Fort Bend Co.

I, H. J. Walger County Surveyor of Fort Bend Co. Texas do hereby certify that this Sketch is a fair Representation of the Survey placed thereon. And that the Statements and facts set forth are true and correct.

H. J. Walger
County Surveyor of Fort Bend Co.
counter 22932

M¹

27

~~16 1/2~~ 23-16 1/2

Fort Bend Co

Sketch file 16 1/2.

See sketch No 16
by State Sur. Weed

Filed Dec 31/95.
H. J. [Signature]
Chief Clerk

See F. Goss's
for sketch in
Walden

32 31 30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Fort Bend Co. St. Fil. #16 1/2

M⁸

County 22933

8

Sketch file #76 1/2
~~#76 1/2~~

Fort Bend County

Sketches and connections of
H. & T. C. Rybo. surveys on
Coon & Cottonwood Creeks
S.W. from Richmond.

By H. J. Walgen
Co. Survey Fort Bend Co.

Filed Dec 31/90



AUSTIN, TEXAS.



509

counter 78182

