

Longview, Texas
March 30th, 1931

Hon. J. H. Walker
Comm'r General Land Office
Austin, Texas

Dear Sir:

In compliance with your letter, dated March 17th, 1931, I beg to submit the additional information regarding the J. R. Castleberry Sch. File 12725 in Gregg County, Texas.

In my opinion the West line of the B. P. Miller survey #247 lying south of the S. S. Davis survey, is controlled by the original Position of the B. N. Hampton survey as surveyed by Thos. D. Brooks.

As I could not find and identify the witness trees as described by Brooks for the S.E. and N.E. Corner of his survey of the Hampton, I went to the Recognized N.W. Corner of said Hampton survey, same being in the center of a Public road 18 varas wide and opposite an old fence going South, same being the recognized N.E. Corner of the P. McAnally survey. From said corner I ran West 333 varas to the branch described by Brooks in his Field Notes of the McAnally survey. (Brooks says this distance is 325 varas....)

I then returned to the recognized N.W. Corner of the Hampton survey and ran East at 1143.0 varas a stake in center of said road (the recognized South line of the J. Ruddle survey) and opposite the center of an old lane going south, same being recognized as the N.E. Corner of the Hampton survey (as resurveyed by Glasco) and the N.W. Corner of the S.S. Davis survey.... Original Witness trees missing.... (93 varas South of this corner I looked for the Old Cherokee Trace, but Old Fields have destroyed all evidence of same. I continued East in all 1779 varas and looked for the Witness Trees described by Brooks in his Field Notes of the B. N. Hampton survey, but did not find them... This corner would probably be in Public road going East and West along the entire length of the J. Ruddle Survey.

x west
I then ran South (found a few old marked trees) and at 1450 varas intersect the Old Cherokee Trace (Course S22 degrees East) 809 varas East from a Large White Oak Tree standing in fence 24 varas South of Old Concrete Dipping Vat, the recognized South East corner of the S. S. Davis survey. From said Point of intersection a Large Sweet Gum (or Black Gum Tree) Marked with an Old X on North-west side and 3 old Hacks on South side bears West 54 varas (Tree Marked by J. H. Simmons, and is same one that I adopted for the N.E. Corner of the Hampton as surveyed by Glasco, and for the N.W. Corner of the B.P. Miller.) and an old Pine stake (same stake as described by J.I. Choice in report to Land Comm'r, dated Dec. 10th, 1923) bears East 4 varas, From this intersection I then measured South, running with an old well marked line and at 735 varas crossed Mud Lake Slough, 15 varas wide, and at 849.5 varas I passed 54 varas East from the S.E.

Corner of Hampton survey as relocated by Simmons and is the same corner that I referred to in previous report and Field Notes as being at the S.E. Corner of the B. N. Hampton survey. I continued South in all 864 varas set a stake for the S.E. Corner of said B.N. Hampton survey for the N.E. Corner of said J.R. Castleberry S.F. #12725. Found no evidence of original trees.

From this last mentioned stake I ran South and at 523 vs. set a stake for the S.E. Corner of the Hampton as surveyed by Brooks and for the S.E. Corner of said School File, same being a corner of the B.P. Miller survey as trees described by Brooks for both Hampton and Miller surveys are identical. However, I found no evidence of the original trees.

From this last mentioned stake I then ran West 283.5 vs. and set a stake on the East Bank of the Sabine River for a S.W. Corner of said School File and being on the Old South line of the Hampton as first surveyed by Brooks. The Beginning corner of the B.P. Miller survey with the witness trees would be in the river.

I then returned to the stake I set for the S.E. Corner of the Hampton 864 vs. South from S. Line Davis survey and ran West at 330 vs. a dry slough 10 vs. wide and 6' deep, being the same was mentioned by Mr. Choice in his report to you dated Dec. 10th, 1923. (I found nothing to indicate that this was the same point described by Brooks for the Beginning corner of the B.P. Miller survey - no evidence that this dry slough has ever been the Channell of the Sabine or any other river -)

I continued West at 597 vs. crossed a slough and at 932 vs. a stake being the same one that I mentioned in my previous report and Field Notes, same being set for the lower S.W. Corner of said Hampton survey and for the N.W. Corner of said School File on the East bank of Sabine River. Found no evidence of trees called for by Glasco in Hampton Field Notes as the River at this point has cut in some.

I then returned to the recognized N.W. Corner of the Hampton, same being the recognized N.E. Corner of the P. McAnally survey, and 333 vs. East of same branch mentioned by Brooks Field Notes of McAnally survey, and I ran south with fence at 736 vs. leaving fence and at 985 vs. crossing a slough, at 1030 vs. crossing the Markham branch and at 1104 vs. set a stake on West side of branch for the S.W. Corner of the B.N. Hampton survey and S.E. Corner of the P. McAnally survey - could not find original trees -

I then traversed down the River as shown on large sketch and at 210 vs. I looked for evidence of the Hagan Ferry but Bank of River shows to have fallen away - I found nothing to indicate where the old road had left the bank -

I found the deep cut mentioned in Glasco Traverse to be what is known as Mud Lake Slough and by Platting Mr. Glasco's Position of the River and mine, there does not seem to have been

much change in the River - All changes have been gradual.

I then returned to the large White Oak Tree recognized as being the S.E. Corner of the S.S. Davis survey - and ran East 565.5 vs. to intersection of the East line of the B.P. Miller survey, same being an old and well marked line and is recognized by George Smith as his West line of the L. W. Gillen survey and by the Castleberry Estate as their East line of the B.P. Miller survey -

I then turned South and at 125 vs. the North bank of a slough 15 vs. wide (Described as a lake 8 vs. wide in Field Notes L.W. Gillen survey), and at 373 vs. the North edge of a swamp (looked for Sweet Gum marked X described as being S.W. Corner of L.W. Gillen and N.W. Corner Simon Ford but found no evidence of a corner) -

Continuing South with old fence and old marked line, at 543.2 vs. a Black Gum tree in fence line with old marks for center line tree, continuing South at 1202 vs. center of a slough 12 vs. wide, and at 1268.1 vs. found an old stake set for S.W. Corner Simon P. Ford and N.W. Corner of Juan Armendaris! survey, found no evidence of original bearing trees, a 12" Pine marked X about 18 months ago is West 4 vs.,

Continuing South at 1442 vs. center of a slough 30 vs. wide and at 1621 vs. center of lake 20 vs. wide,

2007 X and at 1889 vs. cross pasture road 1914 vs. North Bank of slough, at 1940 vs. cross road going East and West in bed of same slough, and at 1955 vs. South bank of said slough, and at 200.7 vs. the North Bank of the Sabine River. At this point the Bank of the River has caved away within the last year and all evidence of the points where the witness trees stood is gone, but this is the same place where Mr. Herman Castleberry and Mr. Choice found the Sassafras tree.

I then traversed up the North Bank of the River and when I reached a point 277 vs. West of the S.E. Corner of the Miller survey I looked carefully for the Cherokee Crossing but there is no remaining evidence as the bank has washed and filled, but there is a rock ledge extending out into the river from the South Bank and as the River is wide and shallow here, this was probably where the Old Crossing was -

I then continued traverse up North Bank of River to the point I set for the S.W. Corner of the Castleberry S.F. on the Bank of the River -

I am filing a large sketch showing position of the Sabine River as I found same to be by traverse I ran from the upper S.W. Corner of the B.N. Hampton survey down the river passing the lower S.W. Corner of the B.N. Hampton survey and N.W. Corner of S.F. 12725, and continuing down the River and passing the stake I set for the S.W. Corner of the S.F. 12725 on the S. line of the original B.N. Hampton as surveyed by Brooks, and continuing down the River to

the S.E.Corner of the B.P.Miller survey -

Mr. Choice and I start at the same point for the N.W. Corner of the Hampton survey, However, I do not find any evidence of original witness trees - same would have been in Road or Fields and at the S.W.Corner of the Hampton our positions are the same.

And our position for the N.W.Corner of the B.P.Miller survey and N.E.Corner of the B.N.Hampton survey on the S. line of the S.S. Davis survey is almost identical as the Pine stake which Mr. Choice refers to as being the original N.E.Corner of the Hampton is only 4.8 vs. East from the stake I set in center of the Old Cherokee Trace -

Our greatest difference is the fact that Mr. Choice placed the N.E. Corner of School File 12725 330 vs. West from the S.E.Corner of the Hampton as re-surveyed by Glasco - In doing this he let a Junior survey controll the position of a Senior survey -

I find a slight difference between his position of the River as given in his Field Notes of the S.F. 12725 and where I find River to be by actual survey -

It is a matter of coincidence that Mr. Choice ran South 1099 vs. from the Glasco position of the S. line of Hampton and be due West from the S.E.Corner of the Miller for the Miller East line is short about 483 vs -

The only original facts that I find on the ground are the branch on the North line of the McAnally survey, the Cherokee Trace on the S. line of the S.S.Davis and the Sabine River -

The Branch and the Trace fit the recognized positions of the McAnally, Ruddle, S.S.Davis surveys, and the River today practically follows the Glasco meanderings in the Hampton. Mr. Choice evidently failed to follow the River and the Brooks Field Notes of the River do not quite fit as closely as they should - I am sure that Mr. Brooks based his work on a traverse that he ran on the Cherokee Trace -

I will send you the actual courses and distances of the meanderings of the River as I find it to be on the boundaries of the Miller and Hampton surveys, and another sketch showing same.

Respectfully submitted,

Ryan Armstrong
Licensed Land Surveyor of Texas.



Sketch File No. 16

16
6

Gregg County

R.G. Armstrong's Report

J.R. Castleberry Report SF 12725

Filed April 1st, 1931

J. H. Walker, Comm.

C.F. Blucher

File Clerk

Descriptive: 7 Mi. S 70° W Longview



Counter 24581

25

Respectfully submitted,

C.F. Blucher
Licensed Land Surveyor of Texas.

the Miller and Hampton surveys, and another sketch showing same. I will send you the actual courses and distances of the meanderings of the River as I find it to be on the pointers of

Cherokee Trace -

Cherokee Trace -
The River do not quite fit as closely as they should - I am sure
the River failed to follow the River and the Brooks Field Notes of
evidently follows the Glasco meanderings in the Hampton. Mr. Choice
the McNally, Ruddle, S.S. Davis surveys, and the River today proce-
The branch and the Trace fit the recognized positions of
Cherokee Trace -

Cherokee Trace -
I find facts that I find on the Ground are the
of the McNally survey, the Cherokee Trace
of the S.S. Davis and the Sabine River -
of the Miller for the Miller East
of the S. line of Hampton and be
of coincidence that Mr. Choice ran south
of the S.P. 12525 and where I
of the S.P. 12525 and where I
of the S.P. 12525 and where I

Cherokee Trace -
I find a difference between his position of the
of the S.P. 12525 and where I
of the S.P. 12525 and where I
of the S.P. 12525 and where I

Cherokee Trace -
Our greatest difference is the fact that Mr. Choice placed
the N.E. Corner of School File 12525 330 vs. West from the S.E. Corner
of Hampton surveyed by Glasco - In doing this he let a
of the S.P. 12525 and where I
of the S.P. 12525 and where I
of the S.P. 12525 and where I

Cherokee Trace -
for is only 4.8 vs. East from the stake I set in center of the Old
Mr. Choice refers to as being the original N.E. Corner of the Hamp-
the S.S. Davis survey is almost identical as the pine stake which
survey and N.E. Corner of the B.M. Hampton survey on the S. line of
And our position for the N.W. Corner of the B.P. Miller
and at the S.W. Corner of the Hampton our positions are the same.
of original witness trees - same would have been in Road or fields
Corner of the Hampton survey. However, I do not find any evidence
Mr. Choice and I start at the same point for the N.W.

the S.E. Corner of the B.P. Miller survey -

Page 4 - J.H. Walker, 3/31/31.