



WM. H. McDONALD
COMMISSIONER
GENERAL LAND OFFICE
AUSTIN, TEXAS

Halleco.

"B" & "B-1"

~~19~~ & ~~19^a~~

SK. & ER Clark's Con.
line, of Blks. "S5" & "W"
Filed Oct. 13, 1904-

9

Counter 29780

Aug 24 1904

Received as stated \$ 10⁰⁰

W. B. ANTHONY, RECEIVED

Clarendon August 13th 1904

Hon J. J. Terrell, Com - G. L. O.
Austin

Dear Sir:

I herewith enclose 48 corrected Field Notes of Blk. W. Leow Blum Survey Hall Co, also 2 corrected F. N. of L. G. Coleman Survey, together with applications & F. N. of J. K. Zimmerman, and O. B. McClaren, C. L. Craig and W. M. Craig for vacant and unappropriated lands, together with map showing the location of same, also, P. O. Money order for \$10⁰⁰ filing fee, for the vacant lands.

I wish to state that I did this work for Mr J. E. Hamm (sur Hall Co) as he is very old (79 yrs) and decrepit, and if you should have occasion to write or return any of the papers you will expedite matters by writing me direct, at Clarendon, as it is Mr Hamm's wish that I should attend to the correspondence in this matter,

Yours Respt,
E. R. Clark
Surveyor, Donley Co, Tex.
Carmucy 10. 2. 1904

E. R. Clark

Acknowledge receipt and return the sketches to be certified to by the Surveyor of Hall county to be returned to this office together with field notes & connecting line &c 8/17/04 C. von Rosenberg

1a

Log Book

Letterbook

C 8/16

Rec'd Def

10. 02

Var. 11°-10'E

Connecting Lines in Locating the Boundary
Lines of Blk. W. Leon Blum Sur, Hall Co. Texas

Beginning 200 vs. N. from a large st. monument at
N. foot of high bluff, the identified witness Cor. of
sec. no. 1. Blk. 1. of Paitvant sur, all the same being,
by decree of Court the beginning, or N.E. Cor. of
said Blk. W. Leon Blum.

Thence N. 58 W. at 1120 vs. pass the N.W. Cor. of sec. no. 1
Blk. W. Leon Blum, sur, at 2291 vs. identified the orig-
call on N. B. line of sec. no. 3, at 2898 vs. pass the N.W.
Cor. of said sec. 3, at 3438 vs. identified the orig call
on N. line of sec. no. 4, at 4086 vs. pass the N.W. Cor.
of said sec. no. 4, at 4554 vs. identified the orig. Call
on N. line of sec. no. 5.

Thence N 52 1/2 W 716 vs. pass the N.W. Cor. of said sec. 5,
at 1208 vs. a pt. in river bed, the orig call washed away

Thence N 44 W at 847 vs. pass the N.W. Cor. of sec. no. 6,
at 1372 vs. found orig calls washed away.

Thence N 39 1/2 W at 965 vs. pass the N.W. Cor. sec. no. 7, at
1435 vs. a pt. in river bed, orig calls washed away.

Thence N 48 W at 852 vs. The N.W. Cor. sec. no. 8.

" N 66 3/4 W 345 vs. a pt. in river bed, failed to identify
orig calls, washed away.

Thence N 59 W at 773 vs. pass the N.W. Cor. of sec. no. 9. at
1518 vs. a pt. in river bed. Orig calls washed away.

Thence N 75 3/4 W at 352 vs. pass the N.W. Cor. of sec. no. 10
at 659 vs. a pt. in river bed, & failed to identify orig call.

Thence N 59 W 795 vs. a pt. in bed of river orig call washed
away. Thence West 434 vs. to a pt. for the N.W. Cor. of
sec. no. 11. here I found one witness call but as the
distance was not given I failed to identify orig. Cor.

Thence S 75 3/4 W 810 vs. to pt. in bed of river at mouth
of branch, that fit the orig. witness calls. (here I found
that there was an excessive distance from the
identified call on N. line of sec. no. 5 up to this pt.)
(over)

31
Hall Co. Sh. File # B
X

and I proportioned the excess between the sec's, according to their respective widths, which gave me the above distances)

Thence N 79 W at 191 vs. pass the N.W. Cor. of said sec. 12 at 956 vs. a pt. in bed of river, failed to identify orig. Call

Thence N 68 W, 40 vs. to pt. in River near S. bank

" West at 2050 vs. pass the N.W. Cor. of sec. no 13. a st. ind. for said cor. at 5941 vs. a pt. in prairie 431 vs. S. of a st. ind. the identified orig. cor. of $\frac{1}{2}$ sec. no. 11. N.T.S.E. Ry. Co. sec.

Thence S. 14 97 vs. & E. 93 vs. to ^{large} large rock (now large st. ind.) the identified orig. witness cor. for, sec. 23-24-37 & 43 Blk. W. Iron Blum.

Thence S. at 2066 vs. a pt. & failed to identify orig. cor. at 784 vs. pass a pile of st. on E. slope of hill 30 vs. fr. Can the identified orig. call for the common cor. of sec's 25-26-35 & 36

Thence S. at 1143 pass a red rock capped cone shaped pt. 10 ft. high. the identified orig. call, at 1262 vs. pass st. ind. another orig call, at 1857 vs. pass st. ind. on steep hill side on N. bank of Panther Cr. the orig witness cor. for sec's, 26-27-34 & 35,

Thence S. at 1292 vs. pass an old gypsum rock ind. on W. side of branch, an identified orig. call, at ~~199~~ 1919 vs. a pile of rock on N. edge of bracko the identified orig. witness cor. to sec's, 27-28-33 & 34.

Thence S. at 1263 vs. pass pile of gyp rock on hill fr. wh. a rock capped cone shaped hill 20 ft. high br. N 62 1/2 E. 80 vs. an identified orig call, at 1893 vs. pass pile of gyp-rock on N. side of steep hill the identified orig. witness cor. to sec's 28-29-32 & 33.

Thence S. at the proper distance I failed to find the next call, as the Cr. or branch has washed out considerably and changed its channel, I then went the proper course & distance S & E. and failed to identify orig. calls, and am satisfied that this call was made by Latitude & Departure and either the Surveyor or his Chainmen made a mistake, in their calculations.

32

however I found the creeks that was called for, but to get the proper angles from them would throw us to far E. for the other surveys, to correspond, hence as there was some doubt as to the identity of the bearings I abandoned them and gave 29-30-31 & 32 their call in course & distance

I then returned to the common cor. of sec. 27-28-33 & 34 ^{n.w.} and ran N 93/00. & E. 1908/00. To the identified orig. cor. of sec. no. 38.

Thence East 1900/00. & S 856/00. & E. 1918/00. to the identified orig. cor. of sec. 47-48 & 49 & 50.

The above preliminary work formed the basis upon which I founded all of the corrected work in Blk. W. Leow Blum Sur, with the exception of the location and identification of the N.B. line of Blk. S5, D.V.P. Ry. Co. Sur, which is as follows. To-wit:

Beginning at the identified orig. witness cor. of sec. no. 1 Blk. 3, D.V.P. Ry. Co. Sur. in Briscoe Co. Thence South 730/00. to the N.E. cor. of ^{said} sec. 1

" East 28500/00. $\left\{ \text{Var. } 10^{\circ}-30^{\circ} \text{ E} \right\}$ & N 7504/00. to the N.E. cor. of sec. no. 157 Blk. S5 D.V.P. Ry. Co. Sur.

Thence N. at 583 a-ft. 657/00. W of the N.W. cor. of sec. no. 146 Blk. S5; said cor. of 146, Blk. S5, is N. 5972/00. & W. 2666/00. from a pile of rock the identified orig. ^{S.E.} cor. of 1/2 sec. no. 40 Blk. S5, E.L. & R.R. Ry. Co. Sur, at 13300/00. a pile of st. for the N.E. cor. of sec. 290 said Blk. S5.

Thence W. 1900/00. to its N.W. cor.

" S. 417/00. to the N.E. cor. 299.

" W 1900 " " N.W. " "

" N. at 457/00. cross the S. line of sec. no. 48 Blk. W. & 1047/00. W. of its S.E. cor. at 795/00. the N.E. cor. of sec. 300 Blk. S5; a large pebble st. ind. on W. bluff bank of Little Red Cr.

Surveyed at different times from Nov. 15th 1903 to July 18-1904.

Murph Ferrill
 Tom Craig
 Johnnie Rugh
 Sam Ward
 Billie Moore

} Chain Carriers

I J. E. Hamm, surveyor, of Hall Co, Texas
 do hereby Certify that the foregoing pre-
 liminary lines were actually on the
 ground, and all the corners & witnesses
 designated were actually found as described,
 and that the survey was made according to law.

This the 17 day of Sept, 1904
 Filed for Record, Sept 19th 1904
 Recorded, Oct 7th 1904
 in Book P. R., Vol. 1, Record
 Hall Co, Surveys, Pages
 103 to 108,

J. E. Hamm
 County Surveyor
 of Hall County, Tex

Hall County
 Sketch file "B 19"

Connecting line
 accompanying sketch
 on line of Hall and
 Prisco cor. by E. R.
 Clark Surveyor Donley
 Co. for J. E. Hamm
 Co. Sur. Hall Co.
 Surveyed at different
 times from Nov. 15/03
 to July 18/04.

Filed Oct. 13/1904.

John J. Ferrill
 Surveyor