

1059

Supplemental Report on Resurvey of  
certain sections of land in Block 224 T. & S.L. Ry. Co.  
In Jeff Davis Co. Texas  
by R. S. Dod  
Licensed Land Surveyor

Hon. J. T. Robison  
Commissioner Gen Land Office  
Austin, Texas

Dear Sir,

In accordance with the instructions contained in your favor of Sep. 16 relative to the Resurvey of certain surveys in Block 224 and their relation to the G. C. & S. F. Ry. Co. surveys on the south, I went on the ground and at what was supposed to be the S. E. cor sur 683 GC&SF. where Mr Merrill formerly Co. Sur. Davis Co. met us and showed me a few rocks piled up as though a fence post had been set in the mound, and an old line of fence could be traced running east. Mr. Merrill stated that Mr. S. A. Thompson had shown him this mound as the Glenn corner. But there was nothing by which Mr. Merrill could identify this mound as occupying the same place it did when he first saw it, except that it seemed to be on a line of old fence now gone. Mr. Merrill had never seen the bearings called for by Glenn at the S. E. cor sur 683. McCombs pipe was in plain sight 66.5 varas south and 109 varas west, but Mr. Merrill had never tied the two together.

The S. E. cor sur 683 calls for a rock mound from which a L. O. stump brs S 81° W 125, and a L. O. brs S 85° W 163.

About 100 varas west of the mound a hill started to rise to the west, on it were several live oak trees. Nearly due west, at foot of hill was an embankment, apparently a broken tank dam, and some trees had been cut down near it.

We set on the rock mound and ran course and distance for the two brg trees but found no trace of either of them at the spot where they should have been if the mound was in its proper original location.

We found several stumps and roots and tested them for bearings but they did not fit the call for the corner. We also examined the trees standing beyond the distance called for on the hill slope, but found none marked.

The call for the S. E. cor sur 682 is a pile of stone on a boulder. The line east from the above described mound would run over a ridge which runs out to the south and is covered with rocks and boulders, so that this call was not sufficiently definite to fix the location of the mound or S. E. cor 683.

After searching carefully for any traces of the original work of the surveyor, I decided that I could find nothing and that the mound shown me might have been placed around a fence post somewhere near the original location of the corner, but it was too recent to be the original mound in place, it lay on top of the ground, not sunken and partly overgrown as the original mound should be if it had not been moved.

The S. W. corner of sur 683 calls for a "rock mound in a grove of live oak brush in the curve of a hill composed of clay boulders".

There is a rock mound on the slope and near it a pipe set by McCombs as the N. E. cor sur 8 T. & P. resurvey, and in his field notes for this corner he calls for an iron pipe from which "Glenns ~~XXXXX~~ rock mound bears ~~Nx222~~ N 82° 30' E 108 varas, St. Andrew brs S 42° 30' E, Ced on con. hill S 31° 30' E, Jones well S 54° 45' E, by which the pipe can be identified and his positive statement as to the rock mound being Glenns corner implies that he could and did identify it.

This seemed the only definite point of the Glenn survey that I could find, and the position of this rock mound 107 east and 14 north, compared with the mound shown me at S. E. 683, a mile east, which was 109 east and 66.5 north of Mc Combs pipe, confirmed my conclusion that the rock mound shown me by Mr. Merrill did not occupy ~~ix~~ the position of the original corner at S. E. 683, as the difference in northing was too great to be accounted for by any reasonable, possible difference in variation between Glenn and McCombs.

The country from S. E. 683 to S. W. 683 lies in the valley and is fairly smooth and good running and one can see nearly all the way from one to the other, so that it is hardly likely that any such error in northing would have been made by the original surveyor between these two points.

We consequently accepted McCombs call as the best evidence we could find of the original location of the south line of the G. C. & S. F. surveys. We ran a traverse from this point fixed by McCombs call to our S. E. cor 411 and found that the north line of the G. C. & S. F. surveys would conflict with our south line of Block 224, as described in our former report, 34 varas in northing, and would conflict with sur 94, as we had located it, 173 varas in easting.

On this basis we made a corrected survey of Sections 92, 94, 95, 96 Blk 224 to clear them of conflict, and made out corrected field notes in accordance with the facts above reported and under your instructions of Sep. 16 th.

I communicated to Mr. Prude your statement and suggestion as to the proper method of dealing with Sur. 93, and advised to consider carefully the idea of re-patenting as 640 and purchasing the excess as vacancy, but after some delay he notified me that he would prefer to hold under his present patent and apply to purchase the small vacancy north of 93, so I have made out corrected field notes for sur 93 as suggested in your letter of the 16 Sep. and forward them with the corrected field notes for the other surveys.

On Dec 5 when I made the resurvey of the G.C. & S.F. lands I notified Mr. Prude that I had made these corrected field notes for 93 and that a small bit of vacant land appeared to lie north of 93, and advised him of the course prescribed for purchase of such land, and I presume he has written or will write you with reference to it.

In the mean time I enclose an unofficial copy of the field notes which under our survey would seem to cover this vacancy and would ask you to kindly have them examined as part of this report, and if found satisfactory, if you will kindly so notify me I can adopt them for the official survey of the vacancy if Mr. Prude makes application for it.

I believe that the above statements, together with my report of progress already filed with your Office, and your letter of Sep. 16 will give all the data necessary to a complete understanding of the matter and the facts on which the resurvey is based. If any further information is required, or correction needed please let me know.

Respectfully

*R. S. Dod*

Licensed Land Surveyor

I communicated to Mr. Prude your statement and suggestion as to the proper method of dealing with Sur. 93, and advised to consider carefully the idea of re-patenting as 640 and purchasing the excess as vacancy, but after some delay he notified me that he would prefer to hold under his present patent and apply to purchase the small vacancy north of 93, so I have made out corrected field notes for Sur. 93 as suggested in your letter of the 16 Sep. and forward them with the corrected field notes for the other surveys.

On Dec 8 when I made the resurvey of the G.O. & S.R. lands I notified Mr. Prude that I had made these corrected field notes for 93 and that a small bit of vacant land appeared to the north of 93, and advised him of the course prescribed for purchase of such land, and I presume he has written or will write you with reference to it.

In the mean time I enclose an unofficial copy of the field notes which under our survey would seem to cover this vacancy and would ask you to kindly have them examined as part of this report, and if found satisfactory, if you will kindly so notify me I can adopt them for the official survey of the vacancy if Mr. Prude makes application for it.

I believe that the above statements, together with my report of progress already filed with your Office, and your letter of Sep. 16 will give all the data necessary to a complete understanding of the matter and the facts on which the resurvey is based. If any further information is required, or correction needed please let me know.

Respectfully

Licensed Land Surveyor

CHIEF DAVIS  
WITH  
SK. FILE 30

2722  
067  
-131

CHIEF DAVIS SK FILE 30  
FILED JAN. 25-1923.

