

SURVEYOR'S REPORT.

To the HON. J. T. ROBISON,

Commissioner,

Gen. Land Office.

By virtue of my appointment as state surveyor, supplemented by special instructions from your office, of date June 23rd, 1913, accompanied by a working sketch, copies of surveyor P.P. Putnam's letter of explanation of survey, and map attached to same, dated Aug. 4th, 1886, and filed Aug. 18th 1886; also a blue print copy of a sketch by Robert J. Bryan; I proceeded to Jackson County for the purpose of resurveying Secs Nos 1, 2, 3, & 4, cert. 4596 and 5497, G.C. & S.F.R.R.Co. 4597

The official records show that the aforesaid G.C. & S.F.R.R.Co surveys were originally located by P.P. Putnam May 26th, 1886, beginning on No 1 at the S.E.cor. of Sec. 38 Morris & Cummings, in the M.de Jesus Leal north boundary line

It calls for the lines and corners of M & C 38, M.de Jesus Leal, Lubbock, Beaumont, Murphy surveys, but does not call for G.C. & S.F. No 2. Again G.C. & S.F. No 2 calls for the line and corners of No 1, same certificate, also M. & C. 35 and 38, and the David Murphy surveys, but does not call for G.C. & S.F. No 3. No 3 calls for the line and corners of No 2, also for M. & C. 35, David Murphy No 2, and I & G.N.R.R.Co No 10, but not for G.C. & S.F. No 4. No 4 calls for the line and corners of No 3, same certificate, and connections on older surveys on its north, east and west.

In the field notes of the G.C. & S.F.R.R.Co secs 1, 2, 3, & 4, made in May, 1886, surveyor Putnam does not call for any natural or artificial objects on the ground except stake and mound, and connection on lines and corners of adjoining surveys.

From Putnam's explanation and map, filed in the General Land Office Aug. 18th, 1886, it would appear that he based his locations of the G.C. & S.F. Nos 1, 2, 3, & 4 on certain lines of the Morris & Cummings sections, Samuel Wildy, Moore and Leal surveys that he had followed out in April, 1886, or about a month prior to the date of his G.C. & S.F. surveys. Also, he shows that he had some previous knowledge of the west boundary lines of the Beaumont and Murphys, as witness his reference to these surveys and their dotted lines in his map; yet curiously enough he does not make his east boundaries of his G.C. & S.F. surveys conform to them as he has outlined them.

On May 29th, 1894, Surveyor Putnam made corrected surveys on the ground of G.C. & S.F. secs 3 and 4, in which he materially altered these surveys, and called for marked trees, motts, and crossings on Garancahua Creek, by which they can be easily identified. Patents were issued on the corrected field notes. Sometime subsequently, possibly in 1897, J.C. Christy, then County Surveyor of Jackson County, made a corrected survey of the G.C. & S.F. No 2, giving it its original called distance northward from the north boundary line of No 1, but cutting out a small conflict at the S.W.cor. of the I. & G.N.R.R.Co survey No 10; also leaving out a part of the Putnam original survey of No 2, which Christy believed to be in conflict with M. & C. No 35; also by reducing its original distance east and west, with the north boundary line of No 1, from 2535 varas to 2357 varas. The last reduction being made probably through a mistaken transposition of the figures. Patent I am advised was issued on Surveyor Christy's corrected survey, but has been recently cancelled, and reissued on the original survey of Putnam. There have been no changes in G.C. & S.F. No 1 since originally surveyed in May, 1886.

With the primary object of retracing P.P. Putnam's footsteps, I began at the N.W.cor of the M.de Jesus Leal as

identified by him in April, 1886, as being a point easy of identification owing to its several calls for natural objects.

After repeated tests I adopted a point from whence the charred stump of an old Pin Oak tree, in the east edge of an island of timber, bears S.45°W. about 1340 varas and in the N.W. bdy line of the Leal survey, the north edge of an island of timber bears N.66°E. about 300 varas, and East, 227 varas, thence South, 16 varas are two Live Oak trees standing in the north edge of another small island of timber, that are described in Putnam's field notes of the Leal survey.

From the Leal N.W. cor as thus identified I ran East, at 3122 varas passed the S.E. cor of Sec. 38, M. & C. but no old corner was found, in all 5218 varas and set a stake for N.E. cor of the M. de Jesus Leal, which is also the inner west cor. of Sec. No 1, G.C. & S.F.R.R. Co. At this point Putnam calls for a post in the prairie from ^{where} a bushy-topped Pin Oak, in an island of timber bears S.82°W. a Live Oak, mkd X, bears N.54½°W. about 500 varas, and a bushy-topped Live Oak on East Carancahua Creek, bears N.85½°E. At the point I recognize it is in the open prairie, the bearing S.82°W. strikes into the middle of an island of timber mostly Pin Oak, but the bushy-topped Pin Oak is not distinguished; the distance is about half a mile. The Live Oak, mkd X, is not found, but a low stocky Pin Oak, 12" dia. with an old axe mark, bears N.55°W. 480 steps. The Live Oak tree on the bank of the Carancahua was not identified owing to the indefinite description, and the intervening growth of young timber.

Returning to the 3122-vara point for the S.E. cor. Sec. 38, M. & C. I then ran North along the east boundary of Sec. 38 as recognized, passing a succession of stakes, and at 2260 varas came to a 4" x 4" post, mkd N.E. 38, 36, set for the common corner of these surveys. Continuing North, at 4432 varas the N.E. cor. 36, and a west cor. 35, M. & C. in the intersection of an old fence line; at 5000 varas pass corner post of a fence, the S.E. cor. Sec. 34, and another west cor. of 35; at 5989 varas a post at another fence corner, the S.W. cor. Sec. 2, S.A. & M.G.R.R. Co; at 6585 varas in all came to an iron pipe and a 4" x 4" post set in the middle of a graded road, the N.E. cor. of Sec. 34 M. & C. The post is marked 34 on S.W. side, and 18 on the N.W. These are the corners held and claimed by the various property owners on the Morris & Cummings.

From the N.E. cor. of Sec. 36 as thus identified I ran East, 600 varas across Sec. 35 to its east boundary line. Continuing same course across G.C. & S.F. No 4, but adopting new measurement, at 1300 varas I turned North, 304 varas and found a post marked D.W. set for S.W. cor. David White 320-acre survey. Thence ran East, and at 282 varas the east cor. G.C. & S.F. Sec. 4 with bearing trees as described. Again from the 1300-vara point, I continued East, at 1435 varas, East Carancahua Creek, at a total distance of 1585 varas ~~intersected~~ from the east boundary of Sec. 35, M. & C. intersected the east boundary line of G.C. & S.F. sec. 4, as marked upon the ground.

Thence South, 415 varas, and found an iron pipe set in the ground for the common corner of G.C. & S.F. secs 3 & 4 as corrected by Putnam, from whence the east edge of a small mott of Live Oaks on the east bank of Carancahua Creek, is S.89°W. 212 varas, and 224 varas to the middle of the creek.

From this N.E. cor. of Sec. 3, G.C. & S.F.R.R. Co, I ran South, at 150 varas touch bend of the creek, at 495 varas cross the creek, at 513 varas a clump of marked Live Oaks (7 bodies from one root), at 1163 varas intersect the north boundary of Sec. 2, G.C. & S.F. as formerly recognized and fenced (fence now abandoned), at 1205 varas passed the S.W. cor. of No 10, I. & G.N.R.R. Co surveys, and an east cor. of G.C. & S.F. Sec. 3 as corrected, in all 1625 varas to the south boundary line of the said Sec. 3.

Thence ran East, at 353 varas pass S.E. cor. Sec 3 in the east boundary line of Sec. 2, (nothing found), in all 451 varas to the west boundary line of the David Murphy No 2, South 154 varas from its N.W. cor. as staked upon the ground.

Thence S.038W. 1190 varas to the corner of the

two Murphy surveys, from whence a Live Oak tree on the west bank of the Carancahua Creek, hacked and blazed, bears East, 316 varas.

Thence South, at 1305 varas the M.de Jesus Leal N.E.cor. as identified is East, 524 varas; in all 1350 varas to an old stake mkd S.W.D.M. at the S.W.cor.of the lower David Murphy, from whence an old marked Pin Oak, on the east bank of the Carancahua, bears East, 307 varas. original bearing.

Returning to the N.E.cor.of the M.de Jesus Leal, which is also the inner west cor. of the Sec.I, G.C. & S.F.R.R. Co surveys; I ran South, and set a stake at 1378 varas for the S.W.cor. of the said Sec.I, in the Leal east boundary; in all 1886 varas, and intersected the north boundary line of the S.O.Lubbock survey, at a point that is S.89°E. 141 varas from a cement block at its N.W.corner.

Thence ran S.89°E. at about 925 varas crossing the county line into Matagorda County; at 1690 varas the N.E. cor. of Lubbock, from whence a double Pin Oak, N.prong 10", S.prong 18", mkd ~~X~~ bears S.7½°W. 3 varas; in all 1700 varas to Carancahua Creek, and terminated my survey upon the ground; the time embraced in the survey being from July 1st to 5th, inclusive. -----

The following described documents are attached hereto, and made a part of this report, to say: first; a map of this survey, marked Exhibit "A", showing the G.C. & S.F.R.R. Co secs I, 2, 3, 4, and surrounding surveys, as above revealed. (The distances in brackets are the actual measurements taken, where they differ from the called distances); second, a blue print copy, marked Exhibit "B", of P.P.Putnam's plat, filed in the General Land Office, Aug. 18th, 1886, in connection with his survey of the G.C. & S.F.R.R. Co sections; third, a certified copy, marked Exhibit "C", of Putnam's report on these surveys also filed Aug. 18th, 1886; and fourth, a copy of the fieldnotes of J.C.Christy's correction of G.C. & S.F. sec 2, marked Exhibit "D".-----

This survey upon the ground, as revealed in the map marked exhibit "A", establishes the peculiar fact that P.p. Putnam's corrected survey of G.C. & S.F. sec. 3, on May 29th, 1894, created a conflict of 462 varas with his own survey of G.C. & S.F. sec. 3, in May, 1886, in their respective south and north bdies. The true lines and corners of No 3 as corrected, are fixed upon the ground by its several calls for natural objects, which are easily identified; and by giving it its called distances therefrom. Also Sec. 2 is fixed by its calls for the lines and corners of older surveys already established upon the ground, and its connection with Putnam's own work in April, 1886; and cannot reasonably be placed anywhere else. It is to be noted that Surveyor Christy, as early as 1897, places the north bdy line of Sec. 2 where I identify it now.

From Putnam's report filed Aug. 18th, 1886, we learn that he based his locations of the G.C. & S.F. secs I, 2, 3 and 4 on lines run by him on the M.de Jesus Leal and Morris & Cummings, and that he had some previous knowledge of the core of the Beaumont and Murphy surveys through running the line between Jackson and Matagorda Counties. It does not appear that he had made any direct connection from these surveys on the east, to the Morris & Cummings or M.de Jesus Leal on the west. His plat, marked Exhibit "B", shows that he believed the S.W. cor. sec. 2, S.A. & M.G.R.R. Co, and Secs 34 and 35, M&C to be at or near each other, and in fact the fieldnotes of sec. 35 would give him good reason to think so. There can be no doubt that from the information derived from his official record, he believed the S.A. & M.G. surveys, the David White, Murphys and Beaumont, to be some distance further north than they were in reality, and he made his fieldnotes of the four G.C. & S.F. surveys accordingly, in May, 1886.

In May, 1894, Putnam, apprised of his error, went upon the ground, and made corrected surveys of Nos 3 and 4, basing them on the lines of the S.A. & M.G., White, and I. & G.N. No 10 as now recognized, and in so doing lapped his No 3 some 462 varas down on his own existing survey of No 2, but made no change in Nos 1 and 2, which stand as originally surveyed.

It is a curious commentary on Putnam's surveying that on July 13th, 1894, he again went upon the ground and made a corrected survey of the I. & G. N. sec. 10, in which he cut a piece out of his recently corrected survey No 3, G. C. & S. F. as outlined by the dotted lines extending from the N. W. cor of the David Murphy around to the S. W. cor. No 10, in the map attached hereto marked Exhibit "A". Said survey is of record in Book "C" in Jackson County, but was again corrected by Fred. S. Robbins of Matagorda County.

As Surveyor Putnam was mistaken in the true location of the S. A. & M. G. surveys in 1886, in the north; they being some 500 varas farther south; so also he was mistaken in the true location of the Lubbock survey in the south, which proves to be 508 varas, or nearly a corresponding distance farther south than he at that time believed it to be.

As hereinbefore stated J. C. Christy made a corrected survey of G. C. & S. F. No 2 in which, among other changes, he moved the Morris & Cummings sec. 35, some 456 varas south of its former location, and on to land within the boundaries as originally surveyed, of said G. C. & S. F. No 2. Your surveyor believes that this action of surveyor Christy was improper, and based on false conclusions; and that no part of G. C. & S. F. No 2 was ever in conflict with M. & C. sec. 35. While M. & C. sec. 35 calls to begin at the S. W. cor. S. A. & M. G. R. R. Co; thence East, 600 varas; thence South, 4201 varas. It also calls from its S. W. cor. thence North at 16 varas passes S. E. cor. sec. 36, 2178 varas the N. E. cor. of same; it also calls for the S. E. cor. sec. 33, and S. W. and S. E. cors sec. 34, same surveys; thence North, 1545 varas to the beginning, which is only 35 varas short of the called distance to the N. E. cor. of sec 34. The working sketch furnished by your office compiled no doubt from official data, shows that in the view of the earlier surveyors of the Morris & Cummings surveys, secs 34 and 35, and the S. A. & M. G. R. R. Co cornered nearly if not quite together. If subsequent developments have revealed that these surveyors were in error regarding the S. A. & M. G. and that its true location was some 500 varas farther south, the later knowledge, in the opinion of your surveyor, does not in effect also move sec. 35 farther south, it being already fixed upon the ground. Sec. 35 is tied inseparably to the other Morris & Cummings secs; was intended to fill the gap between secs. 34 and 36, and should be considered an integral part of that block or system of survey and controlled by its calls for those sections, rather than by the S. A. & M. G. R. R. Co. sec. 2. The establishing therefore of the latter survey farther south from where it was formerly supposed to be, only served to create a conflict between it and sec. 35; while sec. 35 at its S. W. cor. in the prairie is fixed by its call for the S. E. cor. sec. 36, at 16 varas.

Respectfully submitted

Wm. H. Leckie
State Surveyor

I, Wm H. Leckie, State Surveyor by virtue of appointment by the Commissioner of the General Land Office of the State of Texas, under his statutory authority, do hereby certify that the foregoing described survey was made by me upon the ground, between the dates named, and that the lines, corners, and prevailing conditions, are truly and correctly set forth and described, so far as they came under my observation, in the foregoing plat and report.

Witness my hand at Runge, Texas, 25th day of July, A. D. 1913.

Wm. H. Leckie
State Surveyor

File No. ~~10~~ 16

Jackson County,

Report of W. H. Leackie

State Surveyor, on resume of
surveys Nos. 1, 2, 3 + 4. E.P. + S.F.
Ry. Co. —

Filed Sept. 9th 1913

J. H. Macken Com'r.
A. C. Clark
File Clerk.

See large sketch filed
with this. — (See tabe)
rolled at # 9-A.

It is a curious commentary on Putnam's surveying that
on July 19th, 1898, he again went upon the ground and made a
corrected survey of the I. & O. N. sec. 10, in which he cut a line
out of the recently corrected survey No. 3, O. C. & S. F. as outlined
by the dotted lines extending from the W. W. cor. of the David
Murphy ground to the S. W. cor. No. 10. In the map attached hereto
marked Exhibit "A". Said survey is of record in Book "C" in
Jackson County, but was again corrected by Fred. S. Robbins of
Watauga County.

As Surveyor Putnam was mistaken in the true location
of the S. W. cor. of the said survey in 1898, and the result, that being some
distance from the true location, which would have been
the true location of the S. W. cor. of the said survey in 1898, and the result, that being some
distance from the true location, which would have been the true location

of the S. W. cor. of the said survey in 1898, and the result, that being some
distance from the true location, which would have been the true location
of the S. W. cor. of the said survey in 1898, and the result, that being some
distance from the true location, which would have been the true location

of the S. W. cor. of the said survey in 1898, and the result, that being some
distance from the true location, which would have been the true location
of the S. W. cor. of the said survey in 1898, and the result, that being some
distance from the true location, which would have been the true location

of the S. W. cor. of the said survey in 1898, and the result, that being some
distance from the true location, which would have been the true location
of the S. W. cor. of the said survey in 1898, and the result, that being some
distance from the true location, which would have been the true location

of the S. W. cor. of the said survey in 1898, and the result, that being some
distance from the true location, which would have been the true location
of the S. W. cor. of the said survey in 1898, and the result, that being some
distance from the true location, which would have been the true location

of the S. W. cor. of the said survey in 1898, and the result, that being some
distance from the true location, which would have been the true location
of the S. W. cor. of the said survey in 1898, and the result, that being some
distance from the true location, which would have been the true location

of the S. W. cor. of the said survey in 1898, and the result, that being some
distance from the true location, which would have been the true location
of the S. W. cor. of the said survey in 1898, and the result, that being some
distance from the true location, which would have been the true location

county 2762

75