

9387
Alpha Chisum 12/13
RECEIVED
E Van Rosenberg
Austin Ltd AUG 7 1913
Referred to Map

Dear Count

We have camped the survey
as set out on blue front
original you have. It was
29,581 $\frac{7}{10}$ no round it. We closed
with an error North $\frac{94}{100}$ East $2\frac{88}{100}$
and found the area to be 8+ some
than shown on sketch. In other
words Survey 5-6 7+8 will have 640 acres
+ 1 2 3 + 4 will have $592\frac{6}{10}$ acres each,
Stephenson is still holding out
but intimated yesterday that
he would prefer that his Survey
7+8 be made in a square of 1900 x
1900 and #4 be surveyed according
to the calls in the field book.
It will be easy to construct the

See Van R #2

7+8 as he counts them but if #4
is run north 990 vrs from the S
We cor #8 then west $1188\frac{1}{2}$ vrs as
called for in the last corrected
field notes made by Frank Hesselby
May 12th 1893 + field in 4th D June
30/93 it will not reach the East
line of the J J Hall by $259\frac{57}{100}$ vrs

The distance East from said Hall
E line to the SW cor of #8 as pro-
posed in survey is 1273.76 and ~~244~~
 $244\frac{3}{100}$ or $1448\frac{3}{100}$ vrs must
of #8 be made square.

Hesselby's field notes call to run
 $81889\frac{1}{2}$ vrs with the north line of
the Basin while we make it 2244
vrs + come to SW cor Anglin #5
or a difference of $354\frac{1}{2}$ vrs He de-
calls to run North $778\frac{1}{2}$ vrs to a
recorner on S line #8 we make

Van R 3

We make this $86\frac{1}{2}$ - He then calls
to run West 95-1 to S W cor
#8 We make this distance $1220\frac{25}{100}$
a difference of $469\frac{24}{100}$ m and if #7
+8 be put in square + the most
close - N E cor #4 be located $788\frac{1}{2}$
m north of a point - $1889\frac{1}{2}$ m
East of N W cor of Geo. Bacon it
will put the full cor #4 at a
point $1188\frac{1}{2}$ m East of the
East line of J. J. Hall and $259\frac{57}{100}$
m West and 75 m South of
the S W cor of #8 if said #8
+7 be located in a square +
 $85\frac{26}{100}$ m West + 75 m South of
the S W cor #8 as one from
above looking at - Again the
West line of said #4 be
connected by Husaby in

Van R 4:

2250 was long - Now add 774 +
863 1/2 (Distance of Basin + Anglin as first
called by Hatchell) = 1637 1/2 (we make it
1642 1/2) or 5" no more) would make
the distance from the S W Cor #8. to the
N W Cor #4 about 915 1/2 or 910 1/2 in-

stead of 990 as called by Hurrelly
If #4 is put in according to the call
for the West line and over the corner
to the survey called for & ready to
go east to the Anglin #5 it will
contain 652 2/100 acres instead of 540
as called for. Now what I want
is done as to have said survey shall
be put in by to contain 540 1/2 or
652 2/100 or 592 6/100 as the proposed re-
survey would give it by giving
567 + 8 each 640 acres and #21
by Fred Heath to 744 1/4 and dividing
the remainder sayness below

614458.00 Johnson Co. 58. Feb 19

2494
860.5 4

1247 0
748 2

14964

19952 4

21535690

193500

1324920

36719890

3613040 12

5645376

68949.00
5645376

12495240

11290732

12044880
11290752
7541280

774

250

58700

15480

173500

1448.

915

7240

1448

13032

1.324.920

no 1, 2, 3 & 4 which appear to me
to be the right thing to do -
If this can be done then
I will have no trouble in
adjusting these surveys. Please
advise me at once - I go to
Hampford as this evening to do
some work for Mr Jacobson
who lives on no 16 adjoining
Day Land & Little Co no 4 on
the line between Hampford & Waltham
New County - I have written
you three letters to which
I have had no reply. Suppose
you have been away on your
vacation or may be sick which
I trust you have not. While
I write to you this & all my
letters are to the office I write
you simply because I know

Dear R. G.

you are familiar with the
whole situation - Did you
get my letter & did you
send Harrison the blue
print? With best regards
and a request for prompt
reply I try to remain
your friend

J. M. Maddy

19. Sketch file
Hutchinson Co.,
Letter from
F. M. Maddox
in regard to
B. C. R. M 24
8-17-13