

D-647A
D976

207
C-306

SURVEYOR'S STATEMENT

This statement contains explanations relative to a resurvey of the David Scott 1/4 League Patent No. 828, Vol. 6, as to its respective location upon the ground, situated in Hardin County, Texas. It is based upon information from the General Land Office at Austin, data compiled from Abstracts, Maps, Private Information and by Actual Survey made upon the ground.

The above David Scott Survey was made by John A. Veatch, surveyor, declared before Chief Justice Henry Millard of Jefferson County, that the above survey was made according to Law, Sworn and Subscribed before him Nov. 27, 1839, and certified to be correct by U. H. Delano, County Surveyor, Jefferson County, on the 10th of August, 1841.

Later on said David Scott Survey was checked upon the ground as to its location by William Armstrong, Deputy Surveyor for Jefferson District on March 12th, 1848.

The description of the David Scott Survey in John A. Veatch's notes are described as follows:

(Note Small Letters Inserted)
xSitu^xated in Jefferson County about 3 miles North of Pine Island Bayou, 13 miles above its mouth
COMMENCED A SURVEY FOR DAVID SCOTT OF 1/4 SECTION x
~~ON THE EAST BOUNDARY OF B (illegible) SURVEY AT A~~
~~POST ON A MOUND IN PRAIRIE~~
beginning at a point being 1100 varas N off and 500 varas E from the N E Cor. of Henry Stephenson's
~~THENCE ALONG (illegible) BOUNDARY~~ survey, a post in mound from which a post oak 10 inches in diam. bears S 73° W 2 6/10 varas dist. Thence West NORTH 2500 vrs a post in a mound in prairie
Thence North
1690 VARAS TIMBER 2500 VARAS POST IN MOUND, A PINE 20" IN D BRS. S 38° E 12 1/2 VRS DIST. AND A PINE 6" IN D BRS. S 61° E 3 6/10 VARAS DIST.
THENCE EAST
2500 POST IN MOUND A B OAK 20" IN D BRS N 70° W 1 2/10 VRS DIST AND A S. G. 7" IN D BRS N 10 1/2° W 5 6/10 VARAS DIST.
THENCE SOUTH 2380 VARAS BRANCH PINE ISLAND BAYOU to the beginning (end of insertion)
~~2500 POST IN MOUND ON NORTH BOUNDARY OF ANOTHER SURVEY FROM THIS A P. OAK 10" IN D BRS. S 73° W 2 6/10 VARAS~~
~~THENCE ON ABOVE BOUNDARY WEST~~
~~2500 PLACE OF BEGINNING 4LABORS ARABLE RESIDUE PASTURE LAND~~

RECEIVED

MAR 9 1948

GENERAL LAND OFFICE

JOHN A VEATCH
Surveyor

P

Counter 25245

It is my opinion, Mr. Veatch did not call or use the N. E. Cor. of the Henry Stephenson in making his survey of the David Scott Survey.

The description used in describing the location of the David Scott Survey as called for in the Patent Notes are partly Mr. Veatch's.

The insertions made between Mr. Veatch's notes, could possibly be the writing of William Armstrong, Deputy Surveyor for Jefferson District, who proceeded to connect the David Scott Survey with the Henry Stephenson on the 12th of March, 1848.

Upon the ground, I started my Survey to relocate the David Scott 1/4 League from the description described in the David Scott's Patent Notes. It calls, (Beg at a post in mound 1100 varas North and 500 vrs East from the N. E. Corner of Henry Stephenson Survey).

The N. E. Corner of the Henry Stephenson League is marked upon the ground by a 4 X 6" Cypress Post in the N. E. Corner of a fence enclosure in an open prairie. I have known of this Corner for over 30 years and is well recognized by Surveyors and Property Owners to be said corner. I have at various times had the occasion to check this Corner by its Field Notes, from the well recognized S. E. Corner of the Stephen Jackson League (The Stephenson calls for the Jackson League) and its call checks within a few varas. I then ran a line North 1100 varas and East 500 vrs to a point supposed to be the S. E. Corner of the David Scott (calls for a post in mound wit. by a Post Oak 10" in diam. bears S 73° W $2\frac{6}{10}$ varas). I made a thorough search here for a Corner, witness trees, marked lines etc. and found nothing. This point is in a Plowed Field used for over 30 years, now abandoned, and on the land known as the Andrew Jackson Tract, never at any time recognized to be in the David Scott Survey.

The Jackson Tract for over 75 years has been known as the Henry Goldman Survey.

I then proceeded to the S. W. Corner as called for in the Patent Notes of the D. Scott, and found nothing, no signs of corners or markings here.

The next call in D. Scott's Patent Notes as follows (North 1690 vrs timber at 2500 vs a post in mound from which a Pine 20" in diam bears S 38° E $12\frac{1}{2}$ vrs. another 6" in diam Brs. S 61° E $3\frac{6}{10}$ vrs)

The timber line has changed considerable in over a 100 years, spread out from 300 to 400 varas. Timber call was of no help. I found no marks on this line or any signs of witness trees or corners at point called for to be the N. W. Corner of the D. Scott Survey.

I then proceeded to the N. E. Corner as called for in the Patent Notes and found nothing. No marked witness trees or line trees.

The call of the East line of the D. Scott in its Patent Notes is as follows (Thence South at 2380 varas a branch of Pine Island Bayou at 2500 vs the place of beg.)

I did cross a branch on this line at 2159 vs 221 varas North of where called for. This call is the only natural call, called for in Patent Notes and fits nothing.

In all, if the David Scott was layed off on the ground as called for in the Patent Notes, I found nothing on the ground to prove up this construction.

I then proceeded to relocate the David Scott Survey as it is now located upon the ground and recognized by property owners, surveyors, fence lines, old marked lines in the timber witness trees and corners.

I started my survey at the S. E. corner of the David Scott. I intersected an old marked line running northerly and westerly and made a corner and marked new bearings. I then proceeded to check branch crossing as called for in Mr. Veatch's notes (Thence South 2380 vs branch Pine Island Bayou). I ran a line northerly 120 vs and hit the north bank of Clemmons Bayou which practically checks Mr. Veatch's call.

I then proceeded to tie this corner to the N. E. Cor. of the Henry Stephenson League and found same to be North 1361.86 vs and West 29.71 vrs from said N.E. Cor. Stephenson Survey instead of North 1100 vs and E. 500 vs as called for in Scotts Patent Notes.

From the S. E. Corner David Scott as now recognized upon the ground as I relocated, I ran a line S 89° 50' W following a very old marked line in the timber and an old fence meandering this line. Also

4

crossing Clemmons Bayou 5 times, a distance of 2498.25 vs to the S. W. Cor. said Scott (call 2500 vs). At this corner I found a 12" S.G. marked X Very old. I also marked new bearings here.

I then ran a line North $0^{\circ} 37'$ W. following a very old marked line in the timber, a dist. of 2496.58 varas to the N. W. Cor. D. Scott (call 2500 vs). At this corner I found a Cow Oak 20" in diam. marked X also very old, and a Hickory 10" in diam. marked X also very old.

I then ran a line N $89^{\circ} 21'$ E following another very old marked line in the timber a dist. of 2498.17 vs to the N. E. Cor. Scott Survey (call 2500 vs) At this Corner I found a Cow Oak 24" in diam marked X very old another Cow Oak 24" in diam marked X also very old.

I then ran a line S $0^{\circ} 37'$ E following another very old marked line in the timber at 2397.64 vs. I hit the N. Bank of Clemmons Bayou (Mr. Veatch in his notes calls this pt to be 2380 vs which practically checks deducting 2380 varas from 2500 vs which is the overall call leaves 120 vs and that is what I made it, reversing said call). In all I measured 2517.64 vs to the place of beg.

The David Scott Survey as now located upon the ground to my opinion is very well identified. It just so happens this survey lies within a heavy timbered low and marshy area. This timber being very difficult to get out is still standing. All 4 lines are very well and plentifully marked by 3 sets of Hacks and Blazes. I estimate their ages to be over 20 - 40 and 60 yrs. old.

The Henry Goldman Survey was surveyed 6/23/68 and certified to by J. N. Dark, district Surveyor, Hardin County. It being the oldest survey calling for and adjoining the David Scott. I wanted to see where this surveyor recognized the David Scott and I made a complete survey of said Goldman.

I had no difficulty locating this survey. It is marked upon the ground by corners, fence lines, old witness trees and branch crossings.

The N. E. portion of this survey is in a large swampy flat, heavy virgin timber. I found original markings in this vicinity. I also found the N. E. corner wit. by a very old bearing tree and also

P³

Counter 25278

checked 2 branch crossings as called for in the original Goldman Notes. The surveyor of the Goldman Survey fully recognized the David Scott as it is now located upon the ground and as I found it.

The Hardin County School Land Sur. No. 261 was surveyed by J. L. McElyea, County Surveyor, 1/29/1897 and the J. L. Hughs Survey was also surveyed by J. L. McElyea 8/7/03. I resurveyed these surveys and find that they too recognize the David Scott Survey as it is now located upon the ground where I found it.

The Hardin County School Sur. No. 386 was surveyed by W. P. Pedigo, County Surveyor Aug. 1901, and this survey also recognizes the David Scott as it is now located upon the ground. I did not survey all of this tract, just enough to prove its recognition of the David Scott.

The W. Co. R R Co. Sur. No. 385 was surveyed in Aug. 1874 and certified to by J. N. Dark, County Surveyor.

This survey also recognizes the David Scott as it is now located upon the ground. I partly surveyed this tract also just enough to prove its recognition of the Scott Survey.

I also made further investigations of surveys in this vicinity to see if in any way the David Scott could be placed elsewhere from its present position, and my work proved up the David Scott is now located where it always has been.

SUMMARY

It could be possible that the David Scott 1/4 League was surveyed as called for in its Patent Notes. Upon the ground I could find no evidence of the Scott being in this location.

The David Scott Survey as it is now located upon the ground is recognized by property owners within , and adjoining property owners and surveyors who have worked arround the David Scott and made the adjoining surveys were in a much better position to determine where the Scott was, as far back as about 75 years. They too recognize the Scott where it is, as their work can be readily relocated.

The Original Field Notes of the David Scott are very vague. The question is, who is right, Surveyor Veatch or Surveyor Armstrong. If the line of the David Scott Survey were changed from where they are now, it would create a serious havoc in this locality. It would conflict nearly every survey in this vicinity and cause an endless

litigation. The David Scott Survey as now located upon the ground has always been peacefully recognized by property owners.

In conclusion, I will state that the location of the David Scott as it is now located and recognized upon the ground will in no way conflict with adjoining surveys and will not create any friction between property owners.

The map hereto attached which is self-explanatory is made a part of this report. I have further information which I did not incorporate in this statement and which is available at any time pertaining to surveys in this vicinity.

I, W. O. Work, a Licensed State Land Surveyor, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing statement is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand at anahuac in Chambers County, Texas, this the 5 day of March, 1948

W. O. Work
Licensed Land Surveyor
Anahuac, Texas,

WITNESSES:

O. H. Carpenter Jr.

Sketch File No. 65

Hardin County
Surveyors Report of David Scott
- and Adjoining Surveys

Filed March 17 1948

Bascom Giles, Com'r

W. Von Rosenberg
File Clerk

Sketch in Hardin County
Rolled Sk. 7

Counter 25251

67