

D-54
Groesbeck, Texas,
June 16, 1942.

RECEIVED

443
JUL 7 - 1942

Hon. Bascom Giles
Commissioner of the
General Land Office,
Austin, Texas.

REFERRED TO MAP

Dear Mr. Giles:

In connection with the corrected field notes of the J. L. Cozby Survey, A-150, in Limestone County, I find on the ground that the W. W. Hanks Survey is located about 315 varas southwest of its call position with relation to its ties to the W. McIntire Survey. The corrected field notes of the J. L. Cozby Survey enclosed herewith embrace the unpatented balance of the H & T C RR Co Survey #20, with the Hanks and McIntire Surveys in the position in which they have been recognized since as far back as February 19, 1878, as is evidenced in the cancelled corrected field notes of the J. L. Cozby Survey prepared by S. G. McLendon, who also ran, in 1877, a connecting line from the east corner of the N. Gilliam Survey to its south corner and around the McIntire. I find that these lines as recognized on the ground today are the same as found by McLendon in 1877, although none of the bearing trees called for were found. I have done considerable work in this area and have been unable to identify any original lines and corners, because the line marks and bearing trees are gone.

The W. McIntire was surveyed by Wm. M. L. Love in 1840, the following year after the N. Gilliam was surveyed by Benj. Sewell. The McIntire does not call for any bearing trees and there was nothing given in its field notes by which to locate it other than its ties to the south corner and southwest line of the N. Gilliam Survey, and evidently it was located by running from the southwest line of the James A. Head Survey course and distance southwest, although it is true that this distance is excessive by 304 varas.

McLendon says in his report that at the southwest corner of the N. Gilliam "I found one tree P.O. agreeing with calls in original field notes and it seems to be marked." There were two P.O. trees called for at this corner and he fails to state just which tree was found, he does not give its bearing and distance and he states rather indefinitely that it "seems" to be marked. I do not believe that it can be said that he identified an original Gilliam bearing tree at this corner.

From this point which he calls the S. W. corner of the Gilliam, McLendon said that he went N 30 W and found a well marked line which he traced 1344 varas through the timber to the prairie. This of course was the N. E. line of the McIntire Survey in the same position in which it is recognized today, but it was not necessarily the S. W. line of the N. Gilliam Survey as originally located.

The N. Gilliam Survey called to begin 520 varas N 60 E of the S. W. corner of the Alexander Whitaker Survey. I have found that the Whitaker Survey is excessive S 60 W by about 630 varas, and the same excess is in the N. W. line of the Gilliam Survey. The fenced and recognized S. W. line of the Whitaker Survey, which is a

counter 30206

continuation of the S. W. line of the Wm. Rice Survey, closely fits its call position with regard to the crossing on the Navasoto River which was 500 varas S.E. of the N.W. corner of said Rice Survey. The S. E. line of the Whitaker as fenced and recognized closely fits the call given in the S. W. line of the James A. Head Survey field notes for the crossing of the Navasoto River, which is 500 varas S. E. of the N. W. corner of said Head Survey, same being on the S.E. line of the Whitaker Survey.

The recognized N. E. line of the Gilliam which is the S. W. line of the Head could not be moved S. W. without disturbing the call for the crossing of the river, hence I believe that this line is properly located. Also the S. W. line of the Whitaker and Rice surveys could not be moved N. E. without disturbing the call for the river crossing and I therefore believe that that line is properly located. The fenced and recognized south corner of the Whitaker is at the intersection of these two lines, and I find on the ground that the recognized N. W. and beginning corner of said Gilliam Survey is in the center of a road 546.4 varas N 60 deg. 03' E. From the S. W. corner of said Whitaker Survey which closely fits the beginning call for the Gilliam Survey which was 520 varas.

The W. W. Hanks was surveyed by T. J. Oliver 8-15-57, or 17 years after the McIntire was surveyed. In locating the Hanks Survey the surveyor no doubt located its N. E. line from the Gilliam call of 520 varas N 60 E from the S. W. corner of said Whitaker Survey. The N. E. line of the Hanks and S. W. line of the Gilliam is recognized and fenced on the ground from a point N 60 E 546.4^{varas} from the S. W. corner of said Whitaker Survey and runs S. E. to the N. W. line of the W. McIntire Survey, and is no doubt in the position in which it was originally located.

Hence I am convinced from my work on the ground that the surveyors who located the Hanks and McIntire surveys located them in the positions in which they are recognized today, but that the surveyor who located the McIntire did not consider the tie for the beginning corner of the N. Gilliam Survey in running its S. W. line, but instead he ran from the S. E. corner of the Gilliam S. W. to the N. E. line of the McIntire, placing it about 372 varas in conflict with the N. Gilliam. Therefore the S. W. line of the Hanks Survey is not a continuation of the S. W. line of the McIntire Survey, but these surveys offset as shown in my corrected field notes for the J. L. Cozby survey enclosed herewith.

I further find that all of the surveys lying between the Whitaker, Gilliam, Hanks and McIntire on the N. E. and the Richard Rutledge on the S. W. very closely fit their calls when the Hanks and McIntire Surveys take the positions I have shown above, although the H&TC RR Co #19 is excessive NE & SW by about 160 varas, and which excess would be increased to 475 varas if the W. W. Hanks S. W. line is moved N. E. to coincide with the S. W. line of the McIntire.

The field notes of Section 20, H&TC RR Co. by H. M. Roberts 9-26-68, and the surveyor's sketch therein, indicate that the G. K. Sessna N. E. corner is a common corner with the McIntire S. E. corner and he evidently located the N. E. line of Section 20 on that assumption. In running his connecting line in 1877 McLendon found the N. W. corner of the Geo. W. Heard, same being the N. E. corner of the G. K. Sessna

to be N 60 deg. E 198 varas from the S. E. corner of the McIntire, which conforms with the field notes of the Heard. My survey shows the same relative positions for these corners as found by McLendon, and I find no indications that the N. E. corner of the Sessna and S. E. corner of the McIntire are common corners. Hence H. M. Roberts' field notes of Section 20 conflict with the W. McIntire Survey by about 204 varas. Roberts' also assumed that the Hanks position on the ground was as set out in its ties to the McIntire, its N. E. and S. W. lines being continuations of the N. E. and S. W. lines of the McIntire, and on that assumption his field notes for Section 20 conflict with the Hanks Survey by about 519 varas. Roberts himself no doubt recognized this discrepancy in 1886 as indicated in his corrected field notes of the J. L. Cozby NE 1/4 of Section 20, wherein he places the S. W. corner of the Hanks 315 varas S 60 Deg. W. from the N. W. corner of the McIntire, which is substantially the same as shown in the corrected field notes submitted herewith.

The S. W. corner of Section 20 is located 504 varas N 60 E from the N. W. corner of the Geo. W. Harbour Survey which is very close to the 500 vara call position as set out in the B.B.B.&C. RR. Co. field notes. Hence I may add that in general, all of the surveys lying between the Richard Rutledge, the Geo. W. Harbour, the N. Gilliam and A. Whitaker do closely fit their calls with the surveys in the positions I have indicated above and as shown on the map enclosed.

Yours very truly,

A. A. Hyden
 County Surveyor, Limestone County,
 Texas.

State of Texas)
 :
 County of Limestone)

I, A. A. Hyden, County Surveyor for Limestone County, Texas, do hereby certify that the facts set out in the above explanation and plat are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief as determined from a survey on the ground.

Given under my hand and seal of office this the 16 day of June, 1942.

A. A. Hyden
 County Surveyor, Limestone County,
 Texas.

Sketch File No. 24

Limestone County
Report by A. A. Hyden of his survey
of NE 1/4 of Section 20, H & T. C.

Filed November 3 1944
Bascom Giles Com'r

M. von Rosenberg
File Clerk

See Correspondance in
School File 798

counter 30209