

Jasper County Texas  
Sept. 18<sup>th</sup> 1881

Comd. G. L. J. Office  
Austin Texas  
Sir

In reply to yours of the 8<sup>th</sup> inst I make  
the following statement

The sketch sent you in my letter  
of 26<sup>th</sup> ult for surveys of J. S. Coan  
L. N. Cornes and P. G. Garbrough  
shows true position of surveys as they  
appear on field and the distances  
then marked were determined by  
actual measurement made on  
the ground.

I traced the South boundary line of  
the J. S. Johnson league from the Neches  
River east found the old line marks  
plain on the timber, along the line and  
it is the line acknowledged to be the South  
boundary of said league by the Citizens  
of the neighborhood and of the parties  
owning the lands on both sides of  
the line when I reached the point where the  
West boundary of J. W. Allen's survey  
crossed the South line of the Johnson  
I ran north on Allen's West boundary  
and measured to his N. W. Corner in the  
Johnson league and found the bearings as

no distance given

did not give the distance

E

#120  
Jasper Co. St. Hk

Called for in Allen's field notes the one  
of the bearing ~~tree~~ had fallen but the marks were  
plain on the log. The other (a white oak)  
was still standing and bears the marks  
I then returned to the point where the  
west line of the Allen crosses the south  
line of the Johnson and run east and  
measured on the Johnson found old  
marks at 1150. There found the  
east line of the Allen. I then run  
now the Allen to his N.E. Corner  
found both the bearing trees (pines) bearing  
the marks as called for in the Allen  
field notes. I then continued to trace  
the S. line of the Johnson east to his S.E.  
Corner found a hickory bearing corner  
marks and found a plainly marked  
line leading north which is acknowledged  
as the E. line of the Johnson league and  
is the line on which the surveyor  
acknowledged to be the E. line of  
the Johnson when he divided that  
survey between Johnson's heirs some  
12 or 15 years ago. I then returned to the  
point where the west line of the J.M.  
Allen crosses the south line of the  
Johnson and run south on a plainly  
marked line which is known by the  
Citizens as the east line of the

no distance given

E

No other traces of them

John R. Salsbery (Hogatt) and west line  
of the J. M. Allen. I passed the S. W. Corner  
of the Allen and intersected the N. line  
of the John J. Laird. I found two  
stumps agreeing in course and  
distance for the bearing in the original  
field notes of the Salsbery Survey.  
but was so decayed that the marks  
were entirely gone if ever there  
I then run west on Laird's N. line  
and Salsbery's S. line 590 yards  
the distance mentioned in Laird's  
field notes. but found no corner  
or line marks leading south,  
though plenty of timbers bear them  
at 66 yards I found Laird's N. W.  
Corner as described in his field notes  
both the pines yet standing and  
plainly bearing the corner marks  
I then run south on a plainly  
marked line 1000 yards and found  
Laird's S. W. Corner the bearings  
yet standing and the marks plain  
I then run east on Laird's south  
line 50 yards and searched carefully  
for a corner of section 89, T. 1, R. 1, Co.,  
but could find no corner marks  
I then run south on the line of  
section 89 (or where it ought to be) but found

The Surveyor shows that the  
R. R. Survey is not made  
on the ground.

Further showing that the  
M. B. surveys are not made on  
the ground and the extent with  
M. Crockett survey is indefinite.

No line marks though plenty of timber  
to bear them at 782 Varas I carefully  
searched for another Corner of Section 89  
found none. Thence west at 500 Varas  
I found some marks on a pine and line  
marks on timber leading north  
which I traced to the S.W. Corner of  
the J. J. Laird at 500 Varas found no  
line or Corner marks. Thence  
South 624 Varas found no line  
or Corner marks. Thence east at  
1139 Varas found no line or  
Corner marks. Thence South  
(did not measure) to a point due west  
of the N.W. Corner of the Martha Crockett  
Survey Thence east 166 Varas to the  
Crockett N.W. Corner, but found  
that the old bearing trees had decayed  
and some person had cut new  
Corner marks. I then went to the  
S.W. Corner of the M. Crockett and  
found both bearing standing and  
bearing the Marks as stated in the  
original field notes I then ran N.  
on a faintly marked line 1700 Varas  
to the N.W. Corner of the M. Crockett  
as above stated I then ran east  
on M. Crockett's N. line which I

found plainly marked 1900 Sarasota her  
N.E. Corner but could find no  
Corner trees the old timber had all  
decayed but running south I found her  
east line as soon as I reached old  
timber I then ran S. 65° E. from M.  
Crockett N.E. Corner 333 Varas for the  
N.W. Corner of William Whitmire  
Duney (now Elizabeth Whitmire) and found  
the Corner the Magnolia still stands  
and bears the marks. This Corner  
I had previously reestablished and set  
New bearings for Elizabeth Whitmire  
(see her field notes) I then ran east on  
Elizabeth Whitmire's N. line 750 Varas to her  
N.E. Corner both bearings yet standing  
as is stated in William Whitmire's  
original field notes I then ran  
from a point in said Whitmire's E.  
line due east to 1527 Varas to the S.W.  
Corner of the A. Nantz Duney  
the dogwood appears to have  
decayed and gone but the Sweet gum  
is still green and bears the Corner  
marks I then ran north on Nantz's  
west line which I found plainly marked  
till I entered an old field where  
the old timber had all been killed  
at 1250 Varas Nantz's N.W. Corner,  
counter 27798

in the old field but found no bearing trees I then went to the N.E. Corner of Nantz's Survey and found both the bearing trees as named in his Original field notes and run west on his st. line 750 Varas to the point as above named in the old field and made new marks for Nantz's N.W. Corner I then began at the S.E. Corner of the A.B. Crockett Survey both bearing yet standing and bearing the marks as mentioned in his field notes I then run south on W. line of W. Mitchell found no marks except the marks made by me when surveying for G.L. Richardson) at 995 Varas made bearing for the Corner Mitchell's Survey Thence east 278 Varas to the N.W. Corner of Nantz's Survey in the old field as above stated I then traced the S. line of the A.B. Crockett Survey from its S.E. Corner west to his S.W. Corner found line plainly marked at 950 Varas found both bearings but one is dead but bears the Corner marks Thence North on Crockett west line 950 Varas to his N.W. Corner both bearing standing and bears the marks

The surveyor states that he did not find any mark of Mitchell's survey and made a corner for same which only shows that he was not on the right line as the S.W. corner of W. Mitchell and the N.W. cor. of the Nantz survey are identical according to their field notes and not 278 vs a part. It leads to the belief that the connection in Nantz's field notes is erroneous and that between the Crockett and Mitchell's surveys is a vacancy of 278 vs. or that Mitchell's N. line is 278 vs larger as required by field notes.

Thence east on Crockett N. line 204  
 Varas to Jefferson Leases S.W.  
 Corner one bearing standing the other  
 gone Thence North on Lairds  
 N. line 475 Varas to south line of  
 A. Castillo's league Thence west  
 on Castillo's S. line 1172 Varas to his  
 S.W. Corner the old bearings are  
 entirely gone but I was at this  
 Corner in 1876, and the post oak  
 was then but was dead and  
 down the fog had the marks  
 on it. Thence North 5000 Varas  
 to the N.W. Corner of Castillo's  
 league and S.E. Corner of the E. Morris  
 league when I found one bearing tree  
 marked E.M. and the E. line of the  
 Morris leading off north plainly  
 marked on the timber and which  
 has this Corner has been known  
 by Citizens of the vicinity as the S.E.  
 Corner of the E. Morris league and  
 N.W. Corner of the Castillo league  
 and a Corner of the St Mebb league  
 I then run west on the south  
 line of the Morris 578 $\frac{1}{2}$  Varas to the  
 N.E. Corner of the Johnson league  
 and then traced Johnson's E. line  
 south which I find plainly marked

X The surveyor finds  
 the N.E. cor. of Johnson's  
 survey lying 598 $\frac{1}{2}$  vs.  
 W. of Morris S.E. cor.  
 which must be a mis-  
 take as Morris S. line  
 is 10409 vs. to the river  
 and the adjoining E.  
 line of Johnson's survey  
 is 9075 vs. to the river  
 will give a distance  
 of 1334 vs instead  
 of the above stated  
 598 $\frac{1}{2}$  vs. a dis-  
 crepancy of 735 $\frac{1}{2}$  vs.  
 which must be ex-  
 plained  
 E.P.

File no. ~~1A~~  
12<sup>a</sup>

Jasper County

Connecting line, filed

Septemb. 27<sup>th</sup> 1881.  
Dated Sep. 18, 1881.

Rhoads Fisher  
Chf. Sur.

The connecting lines  
within are of very little  
value. The surveyor  
speaks of much running  
but gives but very  
few distances, which  
are in a poor context, still  
acceptable if correct.

Compare Sketch in B-32.

• March 12/82

Thiele

to his south east corner

W. L. Heanbrough & Co. Surveyors  
Jasper County  
to Henry Curtis that the above  
distance is correct and the  
distance therein stated was  
determined by actual measurement  
made on the ground as sketched and  
August 26<sup>th</sup> 1881  
W. L. Heanbrough  
to J. J. L. Brown  
this Sept. 18<sup>th</sup> 1881