

Statement with regard to Survey Surveys made for  
the Houston & Texas Central Railway Company

Survey No. 13

This Survey as corrected May 21<sup>st</sup> 1874, is re-  
ported by the General Land Office, "to be in conflict  
with a patented Survey in the name of D. Floyd,  
and that the calls for the Beatty Surveys seem  
to be wrong" ——— All the maps  
from the Genl. Land Office represent the N.W. corner of D.  
Floyd & the N.E. corner of P. McDonough as identical  
but not finding the bearings of P. McDonough to answer  
to those of D. Floyd, & finding no line from  
thence East, I measured from the S.W. corner of  
D. Floyd North to the N.E. corner of P. McDon-  
ough, <sup>at</sup> that time found it to chain 1700 vs.,  
and finding a deficit in D. Floyd's West line  
and a marked line continuing North, I extended  
the line the the length of 1900 vs (or 200 vs more)  
& after diligent search <sup>finding my corner</sup> I established one.

By subsequent measurements on the E.P. Mi-  
sick, P. McDonough & Jas Shelton, I am lead  
to believe that it is about 1765 vs from the  
S.W. corner of D. Floyd to the N.E. corner of P. Mc-  
Donough, & if so the West line of D. Floyd is 1965  
vs & there cannot possibly be any conflict between  
No. 13 & it, unless it is much larger than rep-  
resented. The maps represent the North line  
of D. Floyd & the North line of P. McDonough as



No. 13

Guadalupe Co. St. File # 15 F

(2)  
 forming one & the same straight line, but to avoid a conflict I extend the D. Floyd North 200 vs. I cannot ascertain how the conflict supposed to exist, is arrived at by the Genl. Land Office. The calls for J. N. & W. B. Beatty Surveys are proper & have been verified

No. 14

This Survey is reported as follows — "Does not close, error in Southings 43 vs — Westings 175 Making out a table of Latitudes & Departures according to the recorded field notes, I find an error of only 10 or in Northings & 2 var. in Westings; but upon making a recalculation of Area, I found a small deficit & have corrected this Survey and herewith return corrected field notes.

No. 15

Is reported to be in conflict with two preempt coins in the name of Jos & M. L. McCombs

There appears to be a conflict as stated, according to the plat accompanying field notes of M. L. McCombs' Survey & its connection <sup>as there reported</sup> with W. K. Estill's Survey. This disagreement was explained in a statement sent up some months ago

The error grew out of an erroneous representation of the connection of M. L. McCombs' Survey with W. K. Estill's; said connection having been made by running two lines from the N. E. Corner of W. K. Estill, the course of one of which was misread from the field book & occasioned the error. The positions of said Surveys

h 1



are correctly represented on the Sketch accompanying this Statement & on the plat connected with filed notes of Survey No. 14. There is no conflict of this Survey with No. 8 as is supposed

No. 16

This Survey as corrected is reported to conflict with Nos. 19 & 20. According to the filed notes of Nos 16 & 21 as first transmitted and to corrected sketch of all the work <sup>the distance</sup> from the N.E. corner of No. 16 to the ~~reimtrant~~ N.E. corner of No. 21, is stated as 2083 vs, & the length of South line of No. 16 & North line of No. 21 is stated as 1829.

A subsequent survey made May 21<sup>st</sup> 1874 found that the former line should be 2153 vs, and the latter 1860 vs. This will explain the apparent conflict of 31 vs with Nos 19 & 20, & would make an apparent conflict of 70 vs between Nos 16 & 21, but not 178 vs as reported. An explanation of this ~~is~~ made when transmitting corrected filed notes of No. 16 & 21 — There is no conflict on the ground

No. 19

New filed notes have been made out & are herewith returned

No. 21

In this Survey the Genl. Land Office represents the error in Northing 47 vs, Easting 84 vs.

By preparing a table of Latitudes & Departures, I find the error in Northing 1 vara & in Westing 15 vs.

The error in Westing is chiefly caused by the rough, steep ground over which the 3<sup>d</sup> course has to be measured, as it tra



No. 21  
continued

verses, a high rugged hill. If this course be diminished about 11 vs as it might probably be, the survey will lack but little of balancing

No. 20

The recent measurements of Nos 23, 24, & 26 disclose some errors in No. 20, but as the survey may have been patented, I have thought it best not to correct until I receive instructions from the Commissioners

Nos 24 & 30

The 3<sup>d</sup> course in No. 24 or the 11<sup>th</sup> course in No. 30, should be 488 vs instead of 458 vs as reported in the field notes of those surveys first sent up. In making a re-survey of No. 30 the error was discovered

When the field notes of No. 30 were prepared the first time, the lines bordering on E. Smith & J. O. Blair, were adopted from field notes of those surveys & some previous <sup>work</sup> on J. O. Blair. The measurements given in corrected field notes of No. 30, herewith sent, are from actual measurements

I will add that when these surveys were made for the H & T. C. R. R. Co, for the sake of dispatch, which the Company were urging, I employed two other surveys to assist me. And although great precautions were taken to compare compasses & chains, some unavoidable errors have occurred from the use of three different compasses & chains, & from the employment of several sets of chain carriers



So

(5)

Some errors are also due to the brusqueness of portions of the country & the diurnal changes to which the magnetic needle is subject.

The cosmopolitan's great experience in practical surveying will enable him to appreciate the force of these remarks.

I A. M. Erskine, County Surveyor of Guadalupe County do hereby certify that the above statement is correct in every essential particular.

Witness my hand this 31<sup>st</sup> day of August 1875

A. M. Erskine

Co. Surveyor Guadalupe Co.

5, Guadalupe Co. 151  
Sketch File  
Site 141

Sanzato Scrip

W. J. C. R. A. Co.

Statement of several  
Surveys.

Filed Sept. 21/1875  
J. W. [Signature]