

1

See letter Book
1232 p. 476

Report of Progress
in a Resurvey of certain sections of Land
in Block 194, G. G. & S. F. Ry Co, Blk. 1, I & G. N. Ry. Co.
and Survey 3, Runnels Co. School Land,
in Pecos County, Texas,
by R. S. Dod, State Surveyor,

Object of Survey.

To locate on the ground, from the holding calls, the lines and corners of surveys in Blk 1 I & G N Ry. Co. Runnels Co. School Land Sur. 3, and surveys in Blocks 194 & 178 Pecos Co, and find the relative position of these Blocks & surveys on the ground.

Authority for the Survey.

A letter of instruction from the Hon. Commissioner of the General Land Office of Texas, dated Jan. 8 1816, authorizing me, at the request of Mr. I. G. Yates, owner of certain of these surveys, to make this survey under my appointment as State Surveyor, and instructing me to make a survey sufficient to determine the facts on the ground on which the location of the above surveys depends, and make a report of Progress covering these facts.

Data for the survey.

A working Sketch furnished by the General Land Office giving field notes covering surveys 541 to 72, inclusive, in Blk. 1 I & G N Ry Co. Runnels Co. School Land, Block Z, that part of Blk 194 east of Blk. Z, and Block 178,

Copy of Plat on file in General Land Office, showing Blk 1 I & G N as originally surveyed in 1876, and relative position of survey 36 Blk. 12 H & G N.

Sketch from archives of General Land Office, by O. W. Williams as County Sur. of Pecos Co. showing resurvey of Blk 1 I & G N and giving field notes of lines run by him in 1892 to determine location of surveys in that Block.

Two sketches from archives of General Land Office by A. N. Lea as County Sur. of Pecos Co. showing certain lines of connection run by him between surveys in the Blocks in question, and his reports accompanying these sketches.

Patents of surveys 51 to 72 Blk. 1 I & G N. kindly furnished by I. G. Yates.

Copies of original and corrected field notes of certain surveys in Blk 1 I & G N, and Blk 12 H & G N, from archives of Gen. Land Office.

Working sketch compiled by R. S. Dod, from Surveyors Records of Pecos Co., showing field notes of Blocks C3 & C4.

Certified copy from the District Clerk of Pecos Co, of the "Findings of fact and Conclusions of Law" of W. C. Douglas, Hon. Judge of the District Court Pecos Co. Feb. 1911, in Case No. 854 Monroe vs Hicox. (Monroe owner of 104, Hicox owner of 34 Blk. 194).

Method of Survey.

Course.

Transit ~~xxxxxx~~ adjusted and tested during the work in the field, was used to determine the course of original survey lines and lines run on this survey.

Solar observation was used to determine true meridian. Magnetic var. of needle from true meridian found to be $11^{\circ}25'E$. taken near N. E. cor sur 60 Blk 1 I & G N, in observed Lat. $30^{\circ}47'N$.

$5\frac{1}{2}$ " needle used to determine mag. var. of lines.

The only point on the old work where course could be determined with precision was at the S. E. cor. Blk Z, at the Barton corner of 3 Blk. C4. Here two Cap rocks bearings are given, and taking the easterly point of cap rock on the south bearing and westerly on north bearing from what seems to be the original rock mound set for this corner, we get a magnetic variation of $10^{\circ}42'E$. for both courses. This is practically the same variation found from the Barton corners east of the Pecos River, and the same variation found for original work in Blks A. B. C. & D. Pecos co.

No local attraction or deflection of the needle was noticed anywhere on the survey.

Distance.

Stadia measurement was used. Target rod read by rodman in front, self reading back rod read at instrument.

Note. Actual measurement between corners in River Block showed an excess of about 20 varas to the section, with a presumption that the original surveyor threw in a chain for each section and in the level valley land not much of this allowance would be taken up.

Between corners on east line Blk Z actual measurement shows an excess of 106.6 varas in 8 miles, or 13.3 vrs to the mile, again a presumption of a chain thrown in to the section, if actually run. But as this line crosses the valley, some allowance would be taken up by slopes.

Beginning Point.

For Block 194 G.C. & S.F. Ry. Co. surveyed by L.W. Durrell May 1883.

On looking over the field notes of this Block it will be noted that no corners marked by bearings are called for. Hence course and distance will control.

The beginning point of this Block is given in the field notes as the N.W. Cor survey 1 Blk 194 said to be at the N.E. cor. Sur. 15 Blk. Z. Sur. 5 194 calls for N.E. 11 Z. Sur 13 194 calls for N.E. 6 Z.

On looking over the field notes of Blk Z we find that it was surveyed by Shadowsky in Nov. 1882, and calls to begin at a rock mound set for the S.E. cor sur 2 Z, said to be at the N.W. cor of sur. 3 Blk C4 which was surveyed by H.C. Barton in Oct. 1881, and gives two mountain bearings at this point.

The only other marked corners given in fieldnotes of Blk. Z, are the N.E. & N.W. corners of sur 33, described as a rock mound 3' high marked respectively N.E. & N.W. 33 Blk Z. Other surveys in Blk Z run course and distance in a continuous chain from sur 2 Z. Consequently the N.E. corner of Blk Z would be located at the intersection of a line north from S.E. cor 2Z, a marked point on its east line, and a line east from N.E. cor 33 Z, a marked point on its north line, if these points can be located on the ground and identified as the footsteps of the original surveyor.

We went to an old rock mound about 200 varas south of rim rock at head of ravine about 1 1/2 miles S.E. of Mr. Perry's Ranch and windmill. This mound was made of a few medium sized rock piled up, and apparently had been in place a long time. One rock had been marked "FRIEND". Mr. Perry said this was the mound which had been accepted locally as the corner of survey 2 on which his house stands. Mr. Baker stated that Mr. Lea had run north from this corner to locate surveys in Blks Z & 194 for him.

The bearings at this corner stand as called for in the fieldnotes. The flat topped Mt. in the valley N 25° W is unmistakable, the west end of rim of this table top Mt. is a perpendicular bluff, the east end slopes indefinitely, the centre is unmarked. The call does not state what point on the Mt. was taken for the bearing, but the almost universal custom noted elsewhere in this region of lime hills with mesa tops ending in perpendicular rims, is to take the rim bluff as the bearing point. The west rim gives a var. of 10° 42' E for the course the centre requires 9° 40' E, and would be an indefinite point. There is no east rim.

On turning S 50° E at 10° 42' E, we hit the east rim of a Capstone Mt. This identifies the rock mound as the corner and fixes the variation of the lines as adopted by Shadowsky from Barto's work. Shadowsky calls for the same var. in Blk Z as Barton does in C4, viz 11° E. Hence a priori lines would run parallel in both blocks.

Mr. Baker kindly took us to a large rock mound on a small hill north of a big mountain, as described by Lea in his report, and stated that Mr. Lea had told him that this rock mound was the original N.E. corner of sur 33 Blk. Z.

Mr. Baker said that when Mr. Lea had first run Bakers north line on which Mr Baker set his fence, Lea had not yet found this N.E. cor 33. Later, having found it, Lea moved Bakers line about 150 steps north of the former line and fence.

The rock mound we saw had been built up recently, I think. And on top was a large white lime rock recently marked N.E. 33 Blk. Z. We did not disturb the present rock mound to look for any trace of the old mound and old marked rock, as we had Mr. Lea's report stating that he had found and identified the old mound and marked rock, and Bakers statement that this recently built mound was the point accepted by Lea.

The "big mountain" north of this corner runs about east and west bounding the River valley. It rises 250' feet above the flat, and is almost perpendicular on the north slope. It can be scaled at only a few points owing to the steep slope and perpendicular rim rock.

The north face is broken by canyons, or ravines, running a half mile or more back into the mountain. In one of these canons we found the corner above described. From this point north to the river is comparatively level, suggesting that this corner might have been put in from Blk 12 H&GN. Lea makes it one mile and 1073 varas north to S.E. 27 Blk 12.

In order to further identify this corner we ran a traverse reaching a point in another canyon west one mile from this rock mound and on the north slope of the big mountain. We searched carefully in the canyon for any old mound, but failed to find any. We noted however that owing to the steep slope many rocks and boulders had in time past been washed out of place and down the slope.

On climbing the east side of the canyon we found an old mound of 5 large rocks piled in a circle round a centre rock set on a flat lime ledge. No marks found on any of the rocks. This mound is 169.5 varas too far south, and 118 too far east to fit the rock mound marked N.W. 33 called for one mile west of N.E. 33 Z.

A rock mound unidentified by bearings is generally not considered a fixed point, as it may be, or may have been moved from its original position, but the location and condition of the old mound when found may remove this prejudice.

We failed to find the old rock mound described by field notes at N.W.33, which would have corroborated the mound marked N.E.33, but at 1880 vrs east & 30 varas north we found a rock mound on top of ridge, and on east a row of these mounds, the last one being 51 vs E. & 43.N. of our point for N.E.2, these mounds were evidently on an old fence line, showing that years ago this point for N.E.33 was known and accepted (or made) by the fence builders. The age and marking described by Lea would seem to favor this mound being at the original corner of 33.

The preponderance of evidence seeming to be in favor of rock mound marked N.E.33 Z as the original corner we used it as a point on north line of Blk Z and placed our corner at the intersection of north and east lines, 106.6 vrs north of point eight miles north of S.E.2 Z as above described. Subject to your further instruction under the premises.

From this point we moved two miles south to N.E.5 Blk 194, and ran east by course and distance to a point for N.E.cor.34 Blk 194, and on 4520 varas to a point on the west bank of the Pecos River.

If above premises are approved this will be the true north line of surveys 37, 36, 35, 34, in Blk 194. And the point set by distance from east line Blk Z for N.E.34, will be the N.E. corner of Blk 194 as called for in original field notes.

In order to simplify our report we here introduce the history of the above survey.

History of survey.

Beginning at S.E.cor 2 Z as above described and identified, we ran north at a var. of $10^{\circ}42'E$, at 200 varas rim rock, at 680 point in flat 230' below rim, at 1889 varas point one vara south of wolf proof fence running E & W, S.E.cor of fence S $89^{\circ}30'E$ 81 vs. and a rock mound with rock marked N.E.2 brs S $70^{\circ}30'W$ 38 vrs. on 1900 point for N.E.2.

Thence north at 685 wolf proof fence, 885 cross creek, 1100 Sheffield road 1900 point N.E.3. On 9 varas rock mound S $71^{\circ}W$ 57, another S $72^{\circ}25'E$ 60. This east mound probably old fence line. At 411 north of N.E.3 find rock monument on top of hill N.W. about 85 vrs. at 715 rock mound east abt 50 vrs fence line.

1506 rock mound east 50 prob. fence line, at 1880 reach wolf proof fence, at 1900 set tent peg mkd N E 6 Z and a few small rocks round it, from which rock mound west edge rim of table top Mt. brs N $5^{\circ}35'W$, East edge rim of long Mt. brs N $2^{\circ}35'W$. Middle of round top Mt. N $28^{\circ}05'W$. A Rock marked N E 6 with rocks around it brs S $85^{\circ}W$ 81 vrs. (Stated by Baker to be Lea's corner.)

On north from N.E.6 at 1680 vs road across canyon at turn in road below rim at 1795 3 flat rocks 57 west. At 1900 point in canyon. On at 115 made line monument, rock mkd East line Z, at 1900 made rock mound on west bank of creek, fr. mkd "NW 7 Blk 194", fr. wh. windmill brs S $77^{\circ}E$, North edge rim brs N $42^{\circ}E$, Middle of yellow hill N $9^{\circ}W$.

On north 1900 vrs made rock mound fr wh Mes 3" X brs West 6.3 vrs. Middle of round hill S $80^{\circ}25'W$, West edge of rim S $30^{\circ}03'E$,

On north at 1656 on east shoulder of yellow hill, 1900 point for N.E.14 Z.

On north at 149 vrs rock mound 9 vrs east, 1759 at boulders at foot of mt. to east, at 1900 rock mound for N.E.15 Z, eight miles north of S.E.2 Z.

From this point we ran west across the valley about three miles, then climbed to a point on ridge, on west 482 vrs to west rim of ridge, on west 1120 vrs to point ~~at 106.6 vrs south of Lea's rock mound mkd N.E.33 as above described.~~

We then returned along this line, and at 1880 found a rock mound of a few large rocks 30 vrs north on ridge. Further on in valley we found a mound of large rocks about two miles east and a little north. On east we found a row of these mounds running north about 43 vrs from the intersection of our two line. The last of these mounds is 51 varas east of our line from the south, and has a wire brace fastened to the ground near it as thought had been at a fence corner.

We moved our corner for N.E.15 Z, 106.6 vrs north built a rock mound and marked it N.W.1 B 194, and took bearings, East edge rim N $3^{\circ}47'W$, South edge of rim of point on north side of draw west, brs S $89^{\circ}W$, North edge top of rim brs S $47^{\circ}E$, rock mound at end of old fence line N $40^{\circ}E$ 67.5 vrs, small rock mound S 106.6 vrs.

Looking north we could see a straight fence line and moving to this line found it would pass 9 varas east of our corner.

We then returned to our point mkd for N.W.5 194 and made a rock mound north 79.8 vrs $3/4$ of the excess found in the eight miles, distributing it pro rata among the eight sections along the line. Marked our mound N.W.5 B 194, fr which

(4)

a Mes 1" mkdX brs N 87°W 9vrs, another 3" X brs S 60°30'E 33.5vrs. West edge rim N 2°20'E, North edge rim N 75°30'E, middle of pointed hill top S75°50'W
From this corrected N.W.5, we ran east, and at 1877 reached fence, left small line mound under fence, and at 1900 made rock mound "N.E.5 B 194", from which a rock mound bears N 63°30'E 89.5vrs.

From this point we ran a traverse round a high steep hill as follows, N10°E 873 vrs, East 211vrs, to a point 6.8 vrs north of east gate post, thence S36°E 1069vrs, South 58 varas East 257 varas to point in creek bed being 3800 plus 1446 = 5246 vrs east and 62 vrs south of N.W.5 on east line Blk Z. for N.W. cor sur 37, set a rock mound mkd N.W.37,

Thence we ran east 1964 vrs and set cedar stake mkd N E 37, from which crack between boulder and rim on west edge of Mt. brs N 12°05'W, North edge rim rim brs N 82°10'W.

Thence east 1455 vrs to foot of ridge, 1761 top of ridge, 1812 to west edge deep canyon, 2188 to point across canyon, here made rock mound marked "NE 36 West 201",

On east at 445 vrs from N.E.36 reach east rim of Mt. about one mile north of where trail goes down to valley. from this point, jutting point of east rim bears S 87°50'E 485 varas, Here we set a flag, went down the trail and made a triangle in the flat with base of 455 varas, and fixed a point on line 576 varas east and 70.2 vrs north of flag, or 1496 east of N.E.36, on 468 vrs, or 1964 vrs in all to a rock mound on low ridge mkd N W 34, fr, which north edge rim brs S 89°20'W, West edge of rim brs N 23°W, a rock mound on east slope of ridge bears east 335, south 170 vrs.

Thence east 629 varas to point in flat about 50vrs east of creek, 954 on top of hill, 1877 noticed rock mound on old fence line 15 steps north. On east at 2036 vrs made small mound on line near edge of hill from which mound West edge top of pointed hill bears N 21°50'W, east edge rim brs N 25°30'E. On east 49.5 vrs 2185 vrs in all made a rock mound on east slope of hill mkd N.E.34, on 100 varas, 2285.5 in all to point on east slope of hill for N.E. corner of survey 34 Blk 34.

Thence we ran east 3686 varas to a point near a road and made small mnd. On east 834 varas 4520 in all to a point on west bank of Pecos river in a mesquite thicket, in a flat, with a possible margin for river bed in the past of 300 varas west.

This point on river was later found to be 1914 north and 551 east of IR rock at original N.E. cor sur. 60 Blk 1 I&GN.

The call by field notes for NE 62 would be North 1900 and east 443 from N.E.60. Which shows that the river bed here has moved 108 vrs east since 1876

This N.E. cor sur 34 measured from east line Blk Z as above, is 512 vrs west of west line of survey 62 if it is run course and distance from point on present river bank, or 404 west of west line 62 as run course and distance from original N.E.60 Blk 1.

But according to your instructions and in accordance with facts developed on the ground, the calls in field notes of surveys in Blk 194 for connection with river surveys was neglected, and course and distance from connections on west was maintained.

Block 178 T.C.Ry.Co.

Surveyed originally by L.W.Durrell in Nov.1882.

Beginning point and Connections.

This Block calls to begin at the S.W. cor sur 543 Blk 1 Q&GN. and we find no call for marked corners in any of the field notes of surveys in this Block.

We find from Durrells field notes that the distance from N.E.34 south to north line of survey 1 Blk 178 is 8388 vrs, and from north line of 62 by connection with original N.E.60, as above given, to south line sur 543 Blk 1, is seven half miles or 6650 varas, a point 1724 varas north of north line sur 1 Blk 178. The two calls are contradictory and inconsistent, one must be dropped.

The S.W. cor 20 in Blk 194 by Durrells field notes, calls for the N.W. cor sur 33 Blk 178.

The platted position of survey 36 & sur 1 Blk 178, and surveys 29 & 30 Blk 194, show that the intention of the original surveyor of the two blocks was to tie them together as shown in the plat.

If actually surveyed on the ground, Durrell must have known where he had put the lines of Blk 178, when he put in Blk 194, and his call for his own work would hold over his call for an open unmarked corner in another block surveyed by another man.

If the survey was made in the office and not in the field, then the intention of the original surveyor of both blocks 194 & 178 can not be questioned, as the field notes of 29 & 30 Blk 194 fix absolutely the position Block 194 relative to sur & 1 in Blk 178.

DG005 CO. SK. FILED 84

Counter 33967

48

Consequently Blk 178 will begin at the S.W. cor sur 30 Blk 194 and not at the S.E. cor sur 543 Blk 1 I&GN.

Surveys in Blk 178 according to their field notes run in an unbroken chain of connections from sur 1 to sur 36, on the east line of sur 1.2.*3 are calls for inner corners of adjacent river surveys, which were unmarked according to their field notes. These calls will have to be abandoned as inconsistent if we have properly located N.W.1 Blk 178.

The south line of surveys 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, & 9, ca., for the corners of surveys on the north line of Blk C 3, surveyed by Barton in 1881, but do not call for any marks or bearings at these corners. On examining the field notes of Blk C3 we find no marked corners called for on this north line, except at N.W.7, call Point of ridge N 57°W, which repeats the call given at both S.E. & S.W.7, and this call is not given in field notes of N.E.10 same Blk which is the same as N.W.7

N.W. cor sur 22 Blk 178, calls for the N.E. cor sur 18 Blk C3, but gives no bearings, whereas N.W.18 C3 has a call for Sugar loaf Capstone Mt. S 72°30'E 3 miles. The omission of this bearing in the fieldnotes of 178 would seem to show that the surveyor, Mr. Durrell, was not on the ground at this corner and was not posted as to the callings or actual position of sur 18 Blk C3.

The N.W. cor sur 3 Blk C4 calls to be 3 miles west and one mile north of this north east cor sur 18 C3. C3 and C4 being both put in by Barton. And this N.W.3 C3 is called for in the field notes of sur 25 Blk 178. This N.W. cor 3 C4 is the S.E. cor 2Z, and was described above as identified on the ground.

Consequently to place N.W.1 Blk 178 at S.W. cor 30 Blk 194, would be under our survey the same as to start Blk 178 at its own call at S.W. cor 178 for NW cor 3 C3, and will satisfy all but the calls for river surveys.

The only question would then be whether in running east along the south line of Blk 178 we should hold to course and distance or make distance for surveys in Blk 178 conform to distances between actual corners in the body of Blk C3.

Exg N.E.18, S.W.9, SE.7, S.W.3, S.E.1, all of which call for mountain bearings, it would seem that calls for open corners in C3 would not prevail over course and distance calls in fieldnotes of Blk 178, taken in connection with calls in connecting surveys in Blk 194. This connection would be broken by the ground by following the irregular measurements of the earlier work in Blk C 3.

Theoretically Durrells variation is 15' less than Barton or Sadowsky's, who call for same variation. But Durrells call for east line Blk Z and north line C3, shows that his intention was to parallel the earlier survey. Hence all lines will take their course from east line Z as above determined.

We would therefore put in surveys in Blk 178 from its connection with the C4 corner and Blk Z line, by course and distance from points on base line run and described above.

Block 1 I. & G.N. Ry. Co.

Surveyed originally by Kuechler in Dec 1876.

Sur 545 " " " " " "

resurveyed by Nelson in Feb. 1882.

Sur. 64 surveyed by Nelson Jan 1882. 12° var. ?

On looking over the field notes of Blk 1 I&GN. we note that each survey calls to begin at a certain point on the west bank of the Pecos river and follow the meanders of the river for a northing of 950 varas. Thence west to inner or westerly corners, none of which call for any marks.

A number of these River corners call for rocks marked I R, or rock mounds, and a few of these corners call for bearings.

S.E. sur 67 calls for "road on mesa N 12 3/4°W,

At a point S 26 1/2°W 886 vrs from N.E. cor sur 63 the call is road on mesa bears N 23°W.

At N.E. cor sur 61, road on mesa N19 1/4°W.

At N.E. sur 543 call is given in Patent, road on top of mesa ~~XXXX~~ N 25 3/4°W

At N.E. sur 50, road coming down mesa N 23 3/4°W.

Mr. Lea in his report on connecting lines, states that at his point for N.E. 61 "road on mesa bears N 19 1/4°W, at a variation of 9°45'E.

Strange to say I could not find this "road". There is a white streak coming down the south side of a mountain known as the S ± trail. But it is not a road and never was. I am told that it is so steep that it is difficult to drive a cow over it. The only "road" at the time the original survey was made 1876, was the San Antonio road which crossed at the Pontoon crossing. This road is on the north side of a mountain and is invisible from any of the points given on the river. This road runs from the east over a mesa and comes down off the mesa in a draw back of a point of mountain, but can not be seen from any point on the river south of this mountain, though plainly visible when the point of the mountain is turned.

I searched the mountain in the direction called for, with the glass, for any sign of a road, from N.E. 61 and at other points on the river, but failed to find it.

I was told by residents that very few old corners were to be found on this part of the river now, and Mr. Lea's report shows the same fact.

I was shown a rock marked I R on the west bank of the Pecos river. It stood on a bank or point of sand, some 10' above the bottom of a gully that ran into the river, and this point had been washed on both sides so that it was not more than 10' wide. The rock was firmly imbedded in the soil and the I R was old and was just below the surface of the soil in which the rock was set. Some 150 varas west of this rock there was a road along the foot of the bluff, or gravel hill, which may have been the old road called for at 160 varas west of IR rock at S.E. cor sur 61.

From this IR rock we ran west 281 varas north 950 then east 179 to river. 75 varas west of point called for in field notes for N.E. 61. Of course no corner could be found, it was in the river, and no road on mesa could be seen N 19 1/4° W from this point.

Returning to the IR rock we ran a traverse south 4928 varas and 4331 vrs east to an old rock mound on the river bank partly projecting over the water. It was in the flat bed of an arroyo or drain from the west and a large rock on which the mound was built was marked N.E. 55. There was a ripple in the river above this point. We made new bearings at this point as the rock mound will probably fall off the bank before long. We marked a Hackberry 4" X brs S 84° 30' W 73 vrs. Mt. Pk. N 88° 30' E, Square boulder at foot of rim S 8° E Lower windmill S 6° 45' E.

From this NE 55 we ran South 2848 vrs and East 380 vrs to find S.E. 53.

The call at S.E. 53 is a rock mound from which a large rock marked X brs S 2° E 210 varas. Here we searched carefully for the X rock but found that the present river is over 300 varas west of where the 1876 survey places it.

The river makes a sharp bend east and going around this bend and east some 300 varas we could see plainly the remains of an older channel, which at one time cut across this bend, and signs of erosion all through this bend, sand piled in ridges and deep cuts, covered with mesquite brush and other vegetation.

We returned to a point one half mile south of N.E. 55 and ran east to the river, passing between two recent rock mounds about 50 varas apart. One was marked N.E. 54. These mounds were about 60 varas from the present bed of the river. Between mounds and river was flooded land.

We now went to a rock mound marked N.W. 69 set \pm 350 varas south of a peculiar bend in the river. It was a sharp bend in hard ground with rock on the west bank. The river ran straight for a long distance estimated at half a mile with a course S 41° E, then turned sharply and ran N 61° E for 500 to 600 vrs.

East of this rock mound mkd N.W. 69 a ridge running north and south came to a point. This point of cap rock was S 46° 30' E 625 varas from point at the bend. This bend and the course of the river east (vid. Map) came nearer fitting the N.E. 69 as described in the original field notes, than any other point we found on the river. But we found no rock mound or hackberry bearing.

Mr. Williams in his report of a survey made by him in 1892, describes this bend and states that he found the old hackberry bearing dead on the river bank, and gives a call from this old N.E. 69 to the point of rim rock S 47° E abt 600 varas. We made a triangle with base from NW 69 mound to point 350 vrs N 1° E on river bank, and find the distance from river point to cap-rock to be 625 varas, as above stated.

From this mound NW 69 we ran east 1590 varas to a point on river bank where a peculiar S bend was found, (vid Map) Thence south ϕ 600 varas to reach a point 950 south of river bend, and Williams N.E. 69,

Thence we ran east reaching the river at 1765 varas, and passing an old channel at 1452 varas. Here the river was some 130 varas north.

From this 1452 vara point we ran S 13° E 1480 vrs. on south 461 varas to point marked by large square rock, being 2750 south and 3387 east of point at bend for N.E. 69.

From point 86 varas north, river bank bears N 81° E 430 vrs just above bend, also small conical hill bears S 65° E 310 vrs.

A line east from square boulder missed bend and ran on east.

93 varas west and 265 vrs south of the square boulder set at 2750 point, on the east rim of ridge we found a rock mound marked NW 545. And 950 varas south from it found a rock mound marked S W 545, described in Lea's report as Ratchfords corner.

From this S.W. 545 we ran a traverse to IR rock N.E. 60 finding it 3804 E and 4684 vrs south.

Mr. Lea gives this connection between Ratchford's SW 545 and IR rock as 3807 east and 4839 north, a difference of 3 varas in easting and 155 in southing.

These three points N.E. 69, IR rock N.E. 60, and rock mound N.E. 65, were the only traces of original survey which we located.

Lea reports no corners found except S.E. 61, but says he recognized a certain bend as NE 69.

Williams report of his survey in 1892 states that he found N.E. 69 as a above noted, N.E. 63, N.E. 60, N.E. 543; He does not report on N.E. 55, but does state that he did not find X rock at N.E. 53.

We did not look for N.E. 63. Lea did not find it.

We did not look for N.E. 543.

To compare the results of above survey and connections with calls in field notes. We find a point fairly well identified and somewhere near the original NE 69.

We find an IR rock N.E. 60 to be 8740 varas south and 7098 east, and find NE 55 to be 4928 south and 4331 east of N.E. 60.

According to their field notes N.E. 55 should be 4750 south and 4221 east of NE 60. These points corroborate each other as points in original work.

From NE 60 to NE 69 by recorded fieldnotes should be 8550 north and 5462 varas west. Actual measurement shows NE 69 as we place it to be 190 too far north, and 1636 too far west.

But we find that survey 545 was corrected by Nelson in 1883. The original field notes required correction as they did not close, the last call in the River meanders being omitted. Instead of supplying this call by actual survey, or by getting the required easting and northing by the difference between north line and south line in the original, Mr. Nelson seems to have supplied the lacking call by south 162 varas which neither the meanders of the river on the ground, nor the balance of the calls in the original field notes, and then shapes the balance of his corrected survey to fit this false call, changing the easting of N.E. and S.E. corners from 3287 to 1610. An error of 1677 varas in true position of the river.

Substitute original westing for corrected westing and we have 1677 varas more easting by field notes and 1636 more by actual measurement.

Hence our connection from NE 60 to NE 69 fits fairly well with the original field notes.

On comparing Williams report of his traverse between NE 69 and N.E. 60 we find he makes it 9079 south and 7617 east, while we make it 8740 " " 7098 ". But if we take Williams sketch and place his traverse on it, starting at N.E. 60, we find that his N.E. 69 by traverse is North and west of his position for N.E. 69 on his sketch.

There must be an error in the traverse, perhaps in the 3rd call S 45° E 2004, to reduce this distance by 800 varas will bring sketch and traverse nearly together and come nearer fitting our run.

The destruction of corners and bearings since Williams run in 1892, the unsafe position of IR rock at N.E. 60, the mound at N.E. 55 liable at any time to fall into the river, show that all traces of original work will soon disappear, and the changes noted in position of the river, all show uncertain the location of surveys depending on the river actually is. The position of Ratchford's S.W. 545 and NW 69, so absurdly out of place, show what gross error can be made by attempting to use a moveable stream like the Pecos as a base for a survey.

The only practical way to approximate the original position of the surveys in Blk 1 I&GN from sur 51 to sur 72 with which this survey has to deal, would seem to be to base the survey on the three points still existing, disregard the corrected fieldnotes of 545, pro rata the small excesses in northing and put in the west lines of all river surveys from the north west corners of sur 69, 80, & 55, disregarding the present position of the river.

If you attempt to base a survey on the river today you may have to go back and change it after each big rise.

Runnels County School Land Survey 3. Surveyed by L.W. Durrell in 1881.

Survey 3 calls to begin at the S.W. cor of survey 70 Block 1 I&GN. surveyed by Kuechler in 1876.

There are no marked corners given in the fieldnotes of survey 3. The calls on the east line of sur 3 would seem to be intended to fit the west line of the river surveys in Blk 1, taking original field notes of survey 545.

But it is also true that the east lines of surveys in Blk 194 & 178

7B

by the same surveyor, Durrell, seem intended to fit, and in Blk 178 call to fit the west lines of surveys in Blk 1 I&GN. And the north line of Block 194 was intended to be the south line of Runnels Co No.3.

The intention is plain, but to bring Blk 194 north to fit the river surveys would pull it away from its holding calls on the west, as stated above, as would the attempt to move Blk 178 north to fit river survey calls.

Runnels Co. No.3 was the earlier survey, made in 1881, next comes Blk 178 in 1882, then came Blk 194 fitted in between the two older blocks.

Surveys 37, 36, 35, 34, were made only 1838 varas N. & S. instead of 1900, why? Apparently because the original surveyor figured that he did not have room between north line Blk 178 and south line of survey 3.

Surveys 38, 39, 40, Blk 194 were made only 1457 vs wide, instead of 1900, why? Apparently because the original surveyor figured that he did not have room between the east line of Blk Z and west line of Sur.3.

Just as the dovetailing of sur 29 & 30 Blk 194 around 36 and # 1 Blk 178 seems to show the intention of the surveyor to make these blocks conform, and as their east lines and east line of No.3 compared with west lines of the river surveys, seem to show that Sur.3, Blk 194 and Blk 178 were intended to be one continuous survey, so the field notes of 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, & 40 Blk 194 seem to show the same intention.

This would place the south line of Np 3 at north line of 194.

Opposed to this we have the inconsistent call to begin Sur.3 at the S.W. cor. of sur.70 Blk 1 I&GN, an open call for an unmarked corner made by another surveyor. This corner, since the disappearance of original S.E.70 can not be definitely located on the ground (Note discrepancy between Williams travers, our run, and position of marked cor N.W.69 as above recited)

The intention of the original surveyor to make his three blocks continuous seems evident from his plat and field notes. This intention, so expressed, was accepted and approved by the grantor when the field notes were approved, and it would seem that under these field notes, either Blks 194 and 178 must be brought up to the south line of No.3 as run from the nearest possible approximation to the original location from the river of S.W. cor sur 70.

Or the Runnels Co survey No.3 pulled down to the north line of surveys 34-37, and west to east line of 38-40 Blk 194 as located from calls on the west.

Note .I have not had an opportunity to examine the field notes of surveys 34 to 40 Blk 194 to see if there is any call for Runnels Co survey lines.

This question seems to have been brought into Court in a suit between owners of survey 194 and survey 34.

The judgement of the court seems to be that there was not sufficient evidence introduced to decide the true position of surveys, hence a practical nonsuit judgement is given. Certified copy attached.

I have attempted to place Mr. Lea's line of connections on our sketch, thinking they might lead to further identification of some of the points of the survey. I based this on the location of Hatchfords S.W.545 and Lea's run NW from this to point "H" and his connection between "H" and "C". And working back from "C" fixes his position of corners of sur 36 Blk 12. From N.E. sur.36 Lea's connection calls for an easting of 4026 and southing of 3230 to stake marked NW 71, then 950 south, 587 east, 950 south, 3911 east to a point on river bend identified by Lea as N.E.69.

This point does not fit our bend in the river, but we found a difference in northing of 155 vrs in the run from IR rock to SW 545, and it would seem that similar differences in variation used or in distances measured might place Lea's identified point for N.E.69 at the same point on the river as where we place it. No other such bend is near there.

As a check on this platting we take his call for 3673 north from N.E. 33 Blk Z to S.E.27 Blk 12, and scale the easting and southing to S.E.36 from his sketch. Find error somewhere in southing.

Mr. Yates showed me a mesquite stake and rock mound with three rags tied in nearby brush as the point Mr. Lea showed him as starting point for Sur.3. From this stake north we found three similar stakes and mounds about 50 varas apart and on a line north at a var. 19° 44' E, none south.

This point was found to be 3950 west and 1884 north of rock mnd mnd NW 69 and was N 65° 35' W from rim rock point S.E. from bend in river north of NW 69.

Mr Yates also showed me a point on a mountain to the south where Lea's west line of sur 3 crossed. This point was several hundred varas east of a line south from stake. Error somewhere, perhaps in identification of point.

In order that I may place the corners, complete the work and return field notes, I would ask that you kindly instruct me as to whether the base line run from East line Blk Z through 194 is properly located and corners

80

(9)

rightly placed under your instructions for this survey.

Whether surveys in Blk 178 may be properly run by course and distance from points on said base line, based on connection with Blk C4.

Whether N.E.55 and N.E.60 Blk 1 are sufficiently identified as original corners.

Whether I shall place N.E.69 by course and distance from N.E.60, or by Williams new bearing on Capstone point.

Whether the west line of surveys in Blk.1 should be run from the three points described, prorating excess in northing, and using original fieldnotes for 545. (of course 545 itself will be controlled by its Patent unless corrected)

Whether Bunnels Co school land should be put in from S.W.70 based on NE 69 or put in adjacent to Blk 194.

All which is respectfully submitted

R.D. Dod
State Surveyor

To the
Hon. J.T. Robison
Commissioner General Land Office
Austin, Texas

Alpine, Texas
June 16 1917

9B

Keep with
County Roll
Blk 178

count 33972

count 33972

PECOS CO. ST. FILE #86

10B

(3)

rightly placed under your instructions for this survey.

Whether surveys in BIK 178 may be properly run by course and distance from points on said base line, based on connection with BIK 04.

Whether N.E. 66 and N.E. 60 BIK 1 are sufficiently identified as original corners.

Whether I shall place N.E. 69 by course and distance from N.E. 60, or by Williams new bearing on Caperton point.

Whether the west line of surveys in BIK 1 should be run from the three points described, providing excess in northline, and using original "reference" for 645 (of course 645 itself will be controlled by its "staple" unless corrected)

Whether Bonanza Co school land should be put in from S.W. 70 based on NE 60 or put in adjacent to BIK 104.

All this is respectfully submitted

J. G. Yates
State Surveyor

To the
Hon. J. T. Robinson
Commissioner General Land Office
Austin, Texas

Alpine, Texas
June 18 1917

Handed to General Land office by
J. G. Yates 6/28/27

See Plat accompanying this

See index book 1232 page 476.

Incidentally this was received 6/28/17

C. F. Bencher
2/11/35

Keep with
County 33973 rolled sketch '57
B. 15.1

10 B

county 33973

Sketch File No. 86

Pecos

County
R.S. Dod's Report of Blk. 194, G.C. & S.F.,
Blk. Z, T.C. Ry. Co. & Blk. 1, I. & G. N. Ry. Co.

Filed June 28, 1917
~~Refiled April 19, 1949~~

BASCOM GILES, Com'r

W. von Rosenberg
File Clerk

This Report was
transferred from
Pecos Rolled Sk. "57"

11 B