5F-15031 FRANK T. DROUGHT CONSULTING ENGINEER 117 WEST PECAN SAN ANTONIO 5, TEXAS August 16, 1949 LICENSED STATE LAND SURVEYOR ASSOCIATE MEMBER OF AUG 24 1949 AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS CENERAL LAND OFFICE Hon. Bascom Giles, Commissioner General Land Office Austin, Texas Dear Sir: Attached hereto please find map titled "Area in Southeast Frio County" and field notes covering an alleged 5.33 acre vacancy executed in the name of Frank B. Thompson, Good Faith Claimant. For a discussion of the location of the surveys lying north and east of T. C. RR Surveys #1, #4, #3, and #6, please refer to my Surveyor's Explanation submitted to your office in connection with E. B. Kothman, SF-14663, and dated February 12, 1945. You will also refer to my more recent Explanation submitted in connection with F. C. McKinney, SF-14982, dated May 14, 1949, which discusses the location of T. C. RR Survey #2 and J. H. Spillman Survey #971 1/2. You will note that in my earlier survey (1945), four (4) original corners and two (2) possible original corners set by W. W. Haynes were identified on the ground. In this, my most recent survey, one (1) possible original corner was found: namely, the southwest corner of T. C. RR Survey #6 at which corner I find a 16" hollow mesquite, decayed to the extent that any surveyor's ax marks would be destroyed. This mesquite, however, is the only large mesquite in the immediate vicinity and I believe same to be the original witness tree. I have made aclose study of the actual ground relation of Haynes' corners as compared to his call position of same and find that Haynes' lines are approximately 2% excessive in length. In view of this proven excess I have constructed the lower

mesquite, however, is the only large mesquite in the immediate vicinity and I believe same to be the original witness tree.

I have made aclose study of the actual ground relation of Haynes' corners as compared to his call position of same and find that Haynes' lines are approximately 2% excessive in length. In view of this proven excess I have constructed the lower east line of T. C. RR Survey #3 off the original lower northeast corner through the aforementioned possible original corner of Survey #6 allowing 1.6% excess in distance. In this construction the southeast corner of Survey #3 is 2.9 varas over the call distance from the southwest corner of Survey #6. The southwest lines of Surveys #1 and #3 are constructed between the aforementioned southeast corner of Survey #3 and the possible original west corner of Survey #1. This line is approximately 2.7% excessive in length over Haynes' call distance. The west line of T. C. RR Survey #5

The northeast line of Day Land and Cattle Company Survey #100/2 is constructed common with the southwest lines of Surveys #1 and #3 with the north corner held to Curtis' call distance from the possible original west corner of Survey #1. The southwest line of this survey is constructed parallel with the northeast line off the southwest corner of T. C. RR Survey #5.

as constructed is allowed exactly 2% excess in length.

The southwest line of BS&F Survey #27 is constructed call distance off the original south corner of the survey and follows occupation. The northwest line is constructed perpendicular to the southwest line and also allowed call distance.

TL

Counter 23145

FRANK T. DROUGHT CONSULTING ENGINEER 117 WEST PECAN SAN ANTONIO 5, TEXAS

ASSOCIATE MEMBER OF AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS -2-

BS&F Survey #30 is constructed in accordance with Hickey's field notes as follows. The southeast line is constructed common with the northwest line of BS&F Survey #27. Along this line the creek falls at 1500 varas being ly varas over the call distance. The northeast line of the survey is constructed partly along occupation with the north corner being placed Hickey's call bearing and distance from the west corner of T. C. RR Survey #1.

Under this construction of the above surveys, an area containing 5.33 acres appears to be left vacant. This 5.33 acre tract is shown on the map as Insert "A".

Your particular attention is directed to the fact that A. L. Curtis submitted four (4) sets of field notes to the General Land Office covering the Day Land and Cattle Company Survey #100/2. The first three sets of notes (cancelled) call for the north corner of Survey #100/2 to be common with the west corner of T. C. RR Survey #1. In his fourth set (patented) due to the fact that his previous surveys contained more acreage than called for in the certificate, Curtis stopped the northwest line of Survey #100/2 short of the west corner of Survey #1. It is therefore evident by the field notes of Survey #100/2 and the surrounding surveys that a small area was left vacant.

Respectfully submitted,

Drought, Licensed State Land

Surveyor

Country 23/46

Filed Sept 3 1949
Bascom Giles Com'r
VES
File Plant Surveyors Report

re- SF.15031

(see Rolled Sk. *14)

By F.T. Drought

Aug. 16,1949

File No. 15

FRIO County

Sketch File