

Mr. R. M. Bunn, State Surveyor  
Matador, Motley Co., Texas

Aug 29/03

731  
64

Dear Sir

At last I have the pleasure to report the result of the investigation of your report dated May 27<sup>th</sup> 1903 of connections in block T, Brady, Seal & Forward in Motley county.

Upon investigating I find that the field notes of survey 1 to 12 are dated Aug. 24/75. 13 to 22 Aug 25<sup>th</sup>. 23 to 32 Aug 26<sup>th</sup> and survey 33 & C. dated Aug 27<sup>th</sup> /75, all filed in G. L. O. Dec. 9/75.

The field notes of survey no. 1 in its beginning call was corrected prior to the issuing of patent, as to read, "said stake is South 2488 vars from South West corner of survey no. 24 blk 4" this would place survey no. 1 & 2 <sup>in conflict to the extent of 1288 var.</sup> with surveys 8 & 7 same block, that is, by constructing 7 and 8 from the recognized S. E. cor. of survey no. 34 same block. Again the bearings called for at the N. E. corner of sur. no. 1 blk T for peak bearings, and without all could be made to harmonize, otherwise should be disregarded, (you, as well as Mr. Eubank's admit, that it is impossible to harmonize the three bearing calls) hence I am of the opinion that the block should be



constructed course and distance  
East and North from the S. E. corner  
of run no. 34 Block T, <sup>giving no excess,</sup> and would  
practically agree with the call at  
the S. E. cor. of run no. 33 for Jones  
Creek, also the crossing of said creek  
in run no. 5. This would then  
permanently locate Block J B, and  
avoid a conflict of 206 var. between  
the two blocks, and close up the  
vacancy between runs 63 & 66 Blk. J B.  
and runs 21 & 22 Blk. T.

I enclose you herewith rough pencil  
copy of field notes of run no. 1 Blk. T  
as patented, together with copy of  
surveyors certificate of correction, also  
copy of original sketch of Block T  
filled with the field notes.

8/29/03 Don P. Cumber

I have by this mail notified Mr. J. E.  
Cubaules Co. Sur. of W. Va. Co. that  
we have sent you the instructions as  
to Blocks T & J B.



Surveyor's Office.

J. E. EUBANK.

643

Matador, Texas, Aug- 7, 1903,

Hon. John J. Terrell,  
Austin Texas.

Dear Sir:-

Some time ago I sent you a Connecting line and sketch showing the relative positions of the J. Poltevent land Blk. 2, the Matador Cattle Co. land Blk. M. and the F.P. Knott land, at the same time I wrote you that I would soon send in a report of all the vacant land enclosed by these blocks; but have been delayed in doing so awaiting your ruling on the report of Mr. R.M. Kenney's work on Blk. T. Which indirectly affects Block J.B., and block J.B. forms the south boundary of the above mentioned vacancy for a number of miles.

I write to know if it is possible for you to take up that work and pass on it soon, Mr. Kenney and I are both anxious to have that ruling made

SK<sup>2</sup>

Surveyor's Office.

J. E. EUBANK.

2

Matador, Texas,

as our work is virtually blocked awaiting your ruling as to location of the N.E. Cor. Survey No. 1. Block T. and after that to determine the policy of distributing the excess in said Block, and then to outline a policy for determining the position of the respective surveys in Block J.B.,

On the ground it seems impractical to locate the N.E. Corner of Survey No. 1, Blk. T. by the peak calls for the reason the peaks are not in sight from the point from which their bearings would conform to the Field Note description, The people who own this land are anxious to have you make this ruling so that they may have their land permanently located.

This matter has been before the General Land Office for a number of years in a loose description, but Mr. Kenney filed with you a few months ago a

counter 32161

SK<sup>3</sup>



Surveyor's Office.

J. E. EUBANK.

Matador, Texas,

report from which you can get all data needed, and if you can give it an early attention we both would very much appreciate the favor.

I have sent Field Notes covering most of the vacancy south of J. Poitevent Block 2. and as soon as above asked for ruling is received I will send in a complete report with sketch showing the entire piece of work - there is a small correction to be made in the meander of the river on North side of survey No. 11, Blk. 2. that will be sent with the full report,

Thanking you for early attention to this work I remain

Respectfully yours,

J. E. Eubank,  
Surveyor of Motley County.

Please write him that  
Mr R M. Kenney Seal Survey has been fully  
advised & C 8/29/03 Eubank  
counter 32162 SK 4



889

THE MATADOR LAND AND CATTLE COMPANY, LIMITED.

MATADOR, MOTLEY CO., TEXAS, May 28 1903

How Mrs. J. Terrell Cour. S. L. Co.  
Austin Tex.

Dear Sir,

I hand you herewith a report of connecting line run by me in Motley County - from S. E. 34 - to Dr. E. of #1. B&K. T. and continuing on to Dr. E. 23. B&K. 4. in this B&K. like most every thing in my beat presents some difficulties - As we are about ready to take up B&K. T. and B&K. T. B. - I would be pleased to have you pass on the construction of these two B&Ks - I will call your especial attention to B&K. T. B. - after you have made up your mind about B&K. T. - - -

You will observe on examination of the field notes of B&K. T. B. there is only one survey that calls for B&K. T. and that is No. 1. - The entire B&K is built by course & Distance from Dr. E. #1 - B&K. T. and makes no further call for B&K. T. - This being the case B&K. T. B. would lose the excess of 206 vs. Dr. & P. that shows up in B&K. T. and - Surveys 8

counter 32163 SK<sup>5</sup>



THE MATADOR LAND AND CATTLE COMPANY, LIMITED.

MATADOR, MOTLEY CO., TEXAS, ..... 190.....

65. 66 - 67 + 68 BOK. T. B. will come in conflict with 4. 5. 12 + 13. BOK. T. - Please pass on this question also.

Very Truly yours  
R. W. Kenney, Secy.

Answered Aug 29/03

Over R

also notified Mr. J. E. Curbanks Co. Secy that Capt. Kenney has been fully instructed.



855

THE MATADOR LAND AND CATTLE COMPANY, LIMITED.



MATADOR, MOTLEY CO., TEXAS, May 18 1903

How pro. p. Terrell - Comr.  
Austin Tex.

Dear Sir,

I have some considerable work in  
Motley County in connection with B.L.K.s. T.  
and J. B. and just as soon as I do  
a little more field work - which I will  
finish this week - I will send you a  
full report. Please suspend any action on  
these two Blocks till I send in my report.

Very Truly yours

R. W. Kenney  
State Surveyor

Answered Aug 29/03

*[Handwritten signature]*

notified J. E. Curbanks Co. Surveyor  
as to instructions to Capt Kenney



197  
13 3 00

Motley County Tex.

Connecting line from S. E. corner # 34  
BLK. T. - B. S. & F. - Begin at the original S. E.  
corner of said survey - from which a cotton  
wood stump of the original bearing tree bears  
S. 35 1/2 W. 74 vs. Peak S. 34 W. (original notes call  
for S. 32 W.) Thence North 1900 vs. a check peg for  
N. E. corner of 34. Thence East 5700 vs. a check  
st. for S. E. corner of 22 - Thence North 3800 vs.  
to a check st. for N. E. # 21 - Thence East 3800 vs.  
a check st. for S. W. # 5 - Thence East at 1311 vs.  
the west bank of Pease River, at 1900 vs. a  
check st. the S. E. # 5 - 2500 vs. S. of the S. bank  
of the river. Thence East 1900 vs. a check  
st. for S. E. # 4 at a point 350 vs. S. of the  
S. bank of the river. The river here runs nearly  
due E. + W. for 1/2 mile - Thence East 612 vs.  
a point. Thence North at 350 vs. S. bank of  
Pease river - at a point where it runs East  
and channel about 100 vs. wide - in fact  
a call for the river here is not very definite  
as the banks are low - and subject to sudden  
changes - at 7896 vs. a check peg 2448 vs.  
South of the S. E. corner of 24 - BLK. 4 - T. & P.  
R. R. Co. as I located that corner from N. E. cor-  
ner of 23 - same BLK. by its call for a large  
st. W. d. near mouth cr. (Tom Ball) S. 68 E. 570 vs.  
I find no original mark on the tree, but  
from the course of the river, and the gen-  
eral formation of the country at the mouth  
of Tom Ball, having high banks on west  
side till it gets nearly to the river, and in the  
bottom on the west bank, there are large SK<sup>8</sup>  
counter 32164



and my judgement is that course and distance from S.E. 24 Blk. 4 - should locate the N.E. of #1 - Blk. T. B. S. + F. and the Dr. E. #1. locates Blk. T. B. -

The question - if so located will be - how to distribute the excess through the Block.

W. 10.40 -

May 27-1903.

P. W. Kennedy State Sur.

*[Faint handwritten notes and scribbles, possibly a list or diagram, mostly illegible.]*



Sketch D D  
Mottey County  
Sketch files

Connecting line &  
C as to Block "I",  
B S & F. in Mottey Co  
by R. M. Kenney,  
State Surveyor

Filed June 1/1903

John Ferrell  
County

See sketch & report  
by J. B. Embaules mkd.  
D1 & D2 - Embaules

Filed June 1<sup>st</sup> 1903.



at. wa trees

giving strong evidence to a surveyor that the creek could not have been further west in the last 30 years, together with the further evidence that a run from the Mexican monument, made by several different surveyors (I have never made that run) locate the dr. E. of #23 practically at same point, as the bearing tree at the mouth of Tom Ball - Besides there are several old settlers still here & have been familiar with the country at mouth of Tom Ball, and they all say it has been where it is now for the last 15 years

Returning to the point 2488 m. S. of S.E. #24  
which is the dr. E. #1. cont. 2'67 A. B. & W. -

The calls of the field notes at this corner are as follows - A point 2488 m. S. of S.E. 24, Blk. 4.

T. & P. R. R. Co. - Montague Peak dr. 8<sup>3</sup> W.

House Mt. dr. 8<sup>3</sup> 1/2 W.

Round Top Mt. dr. 41 W.

I find these calls as follows. (var. 10.40)

Montague dr. 41. 40 W. - House Top Mt. N. 82.40 W.

Round Top Mt. dr. 40. W. - There is no position that will fit all the calls - If you fit one you will lose the others. If you use a lesser var. you will then lose the river calls. —

Now as to the point where course and distance from S.E. corner of #34 would locate this corner. - It will place it in a ravine running North, and west of it is a high ridge, so that any where dr. or S. for a half mile it was impossible for the surveyor to have taken these bearings on the peaks, for they are not in sight. I do not think there is any question about the S.E. corner of #34 (the Tom Hande corner) for the tree was standing and cut only a few years ago. I think there is hardly a doubt as to the dr. E. #23 Blk. 4. (Tom Ball corner)