

K.S. Dod
State Surveyor
Alpine, Tex.

Mr. J.H. Walker,
Acting Commissioner
Gen'l Land Office
Austin, Texas

APR 29 1916

Referral to Map

Dear Sir,

I am returning herewith the fieldnotes and sketch of resurvey of Blocks A, B, C, D, Pecos Co. Tex.

The fieldnotes were duly received but the letter of Ap. 13 which should have accompanied them was not received until some days later. I supposed that the pencil notes on back of field notes, noting typographic errors, were all the corrections necessary and had made these and expressed the field notes to your Office before the letter arrived. It was detained in the Post Office here for postage due and they neglected to notify me. This to explain the delay in this reply.

I have made the correction of errors noted in your letter, A for S and some courses omitted and made the call for the Big Hill corner more intelligible. Otherwise I find the field notes correct.

The apparent conflict in corrected field notes for the east line Block D from sur. 90 to 96 arises from the fact that, as you suggest in your letter, a report of progress made in Sep. 1913 has apparently been mislaid.

The first sketch (blue print) was based on a survey through Blocks C & D, from the Pikes Peak corner (N.W. 1 Blk. C) on the north to the Marathon Road corner (N.E. 90A) on the south.

Then a line east from Pikes Peak along the north line of C, then on east from the N.E. 13 to N.E. 90 and N.E. 89. These lines have been checked over time and again and were correct.

We then ran from N.E. 89 to S.E. 96 in Dec. 1912 and stopped work for the winter.

On returning to the work in August 1913 we ran from N.E. 90A to S.E. 96 and found an error of 141 varas in northing. To locate this we ran north from S.E. 96 D and found the mistake in the east line of survey 90 D, an excess of 141 varas.

This meant the moving the corners on east line of D north and changing the bearings.

This placed S.E. 96 D 1855 varas north of S.A. & M.G. S.W. cor. instead of 1714 as shown on blue print. The line south from N.E. 90 was true but the error in measurement required a change of the 8 corners south of that point, north 141 varas, the new bearings are given in the tracing.

As a further check, when we ran east 743 varas from a point 45 varas north of corrected corner of 96 for S.E. 6 Q, we then ran south and connected with the S.W. cor. S.A. & M.G.

I think this explains the conflict between the blue print and tracing.

I sent in a report of the above facts to the Land Office with a request to note it on the sketch, I received a reply acknowledging receipt of this letter and answering some further inquiries, so I supposed it was understood.

I again referred to the matter when I sent in the second corrected set of field notes under instructions for 6 Q, to which I refer later in this report.

I have gone over carefully your notes for correction of field notes and sketch where bearings were miscopied and course omitted and have corrected these errors.

In explanation of some of the calls I would say that it was difficult to select bearings for corners in east and west parts of Block D which would give definite points to be used as checks on distances and location of corners. Pikes Peak, Antelope Bluff and Glass Peak made fairly definite points on the west, but they can not be seen from the east part of the Block as the Sierra Madera intervene. This is an isolated group of high pointed peaks all of nearly the same height and general form so that it was impossible to absolutely identify a point on the same peak seen from the west as the same point seen from the north. And the peaks visible from North and west were not visible from south and east as other peaks intervened.

The conical hill on the east was fairly good, but from north and west it showed a perfect cone, while from south and further east it showed a flat top.

The corner on the Big Hill which was so ambiguously described, fell in a deep ravine where we could not see any distance in any direction, so we built a witness mound 80 varas north on the ridge and the flag in this corner was a good check on the line south and a nice point for correction of corners east, and our bearings were taken from this mound. I tried to state this in field notes but what was plain to one knowing the location was very counter 33975

far from a clear statement of the facts. I think the correction in the field notes will be found to clear this up.

In accordance with request for our connection with corners in Block 3 T & P. I take the following from my field Book. I sent in a report of progress stating the basis of our location of Blk 3 but unfortunately I turned over all reports and papers to the Elsinore Cattle Co. and this report with the others.

On Monday Sep. 1 1913 we ran north at 10° 41' E var. from the S.W. cor. Blk D as already established from the Pikes Peak corner, 1801 varas for N.W. 1 & S.W. 2, on north at 1439.5 varas reached a fence running N 89° 30' E. A corner of this fence was west 210 varas.

Turning east, at 656 varas found a stake and some rocks under the fence, and another stake and rock mnd 10.3 south of fence and 23 varas west of us. On east at 3 miles and 606 varas I found fence corner N. 62.3 and E. 14.9 vrs and 41.5 varas east of fence cor. I found a stake and rock mound.

This fence was said to have been set by Mr. Joss for the sbl Blk 3. T & P. From the rock mound east of fence cor. I ran a trial line north, at 1907 vrs I found 3 rock mounds, one marked X stood S 86° 2' 10 vrs, another S 12° 30' E 12 and a Palmo marked X stood S 50° E 16 varas.

I tried to harmonize the three bearings called for at S.E. 190 T&P, at this point but could not get them to fit each other. On north at 1903 vrs I found an old rock mound at head of a draw on north side of a ravine 10.2 varas east, this corresponded to the description of the corner in T&P field notes.

On north 1910.5 varas I found a rock mound with a cedar bearing S 6° 30' E 117 varas at a var. of 12° E. This fits fairly well the call for N.E. 189 T&P. and fixed the East line of the T.P. block as run through these two corners.

I then returned to the point 1439.5 north of S.W. 2 Blk. D.

I ran west and at 217 varas found a stake set 11 varas south, this figuring our distance on the east would throw us about 879 varas west of the Blk 3 corner. We ran on west, at 1037 a rock set in the ground, on west 1902 a rock set in the ground. This was along a right of way cleared in the brush. On west two miles we find an old rock mound and two cedar bearings standing as called for the S.W. cor. Sur. 197. Taking the variation of the longer bearing, S 62 1/2° W 93, the course east from this corner would strike the stake found 11 varas south of our 1439.5 point at fence, and give a var. of 11° 20' for T & P lines, nearly true east and west. The course from our Blk D lines would be N 89° 21' E.

The South and East lines of Blk 3 were put in from the above connections and corners and so reported.

In the matter of survey 6 Block Q, I think the field notes must have got mixed in some way, as I do not recognize the calls given in your letter.

My field notes for sur 6 Blk. 1 run thus;

Beg. at N.W. 2 SA&MG. being 1900 varas north of a rock mound the original S.W. cor 2 mkd "SW 2 P".

Thence west 743 varas, to a ~~xxxxx~~ rock mound in ebl 96 D, 45 varas N. of S.E. cor 96. From which rock mound Pk in S.M. hrs. N 47° 10' W

S. Pt. Shp. Pk. S 59° 45' E

Thence north with ebl 96 1893 varas to a rck mnd set for S.E. 95D fr. wh. N. edge Con. Pk. hrs N13° 30' E, Middle of cap rock S 85° 10' E,

on north 504, 2497 vrs in all to rck mnd in ebl 95 mkd "NW 6Q" on a hill, fr wh W. end cap rock hrs S 52° E

Thence East 743 vrs to a rock mnd mkd "SE 5Q" in wbl sur 10 Blk 108, fr wh W. edge Con. Hill hrs N10° 26' E. S.M. hrs N 62° 21' W

Thence South, at 365 pass S.W. 10, at 597 pass N.W. 1 SA&MG on 1900, 2497 in all to beg.

Perhaps it will be well to restate the facts as to Blk. Q as I supposed that Block had been settled long ago.

To determine the amount of land left for Blk. Q. We ran from the NE 89D east 4365 varas and south 156 varas to a corner in the west line of Blk. 134 T&SL, identified by the description in the field notes. This corner was under a fence which ran over the other corners and up over the Con. Hill on east side. Mr. Durrell told me they had put in these corners from Stockton and the field notes furnished me from your Office showed this row of corners as approved and accepted. This left 565 only for Blk Q, as Blk 113 runs 2 miles west of Blk 134.

This gave along ebl D a strip 565 varas wide, 2620 long for (1)

2620	"	2
2620	"	3
2552	"	4 later crct
1944	"	5
2497	"	6 1st

The SW 1/4 197 and bearings here described should be 1/2 mile further west than distance shown by this connection.

According to this connection the course of lines in Blocks A.B.C. & D seems to be N 40° E and course of lines in T & P Block 3 seems to be N 0° 01' E. It is difficult to determine just what this connection is, but it does not see to quite agree with connection on sketch of Blks. A.B.C. & D. 5-4-16-d.w.-P.

This being 3 mi. north west of the N.E. 1/4 197

3
a total adding distance 651 to S.E.96 ,of 15504
8 miles plus 8 x 38 excess along D 15504

But, later on, we found 743 varas between D and the SA&MG lines and also found the error in ebl D.

I was then instructed to put in 6 & 4 to cover this as shown by sketch attached hereto.

I am sorry that this confusion should have arisen, but from what you say it would seem as though all my reports of progress in the work and letters of instruction to me must have been put away somewhere as none of them seem to be at hand, as they would have explained the whole matter.

I believe this covers all the points in your letter, but if not kind- let me know and I will try to supplement it.

Yours truly

State Sur.

Keep With
Pecos County Rolled 2k 53 filed 2-21-12
Report by R.S. Dob
filed 4-22-12

2

counter 33977

15504
15504

a total adding distance 651 to S.E. 96, of 15504
8 miles plus 8 x 38 excess along D
But, later on, we found 743 yards between D and the S&W lines and
also found the error in 61 D.
I was then instructed to put in 6 & 4 to cover things shown by sketch
attached hereto.
I am sorry that this confusion should have arisen, but from what you say
it would seem as though all my reports of progress in the work and letters
of instruction to me must have been put away somewhere as none of them
seem to be at hand, as they would have explained the whole matter.
I believe this covers all the points in your letter, but if not kind-
let me know and I will try to supplement it.
Yours truly

State Sur.

Keep With
Pecos County Rolled Sk. "53" filed 5-31-16
Report By R.S. Dod
Filed 4-29-16

33978

Pecos Co. Sk. File # B7

3



General Land Office.

State of Texas.

Austin.

J. T. ROBISON, COMMISSIONER.
J. H. WALKER, CHIEF CLERK.

May 5, 1916.

4
Mr. R. S. Dod,
State Surveyor,
Alpine, Texas.
Dear Sir:-

Your report and corrected field notes of surveys in Blocks A, B, C and D, Pecos county, have been received and examined. You state that in August, 1913, you found an error of 141 varas in the east line of Survey 90, Block D, but according to the descriptions in your last field notes and sketch the southeast corner of Survey 90 does not appear to have been changed. Please state whether the corners placed by you on the east line of Block D were moved north by your correction or whether new corners were made at the correct points.

The field notes of Survey 2, Block Q, on which patent has now been issued were made before the error in the east line of Survey 90 was discovered, and it would appear from the descriptions that Survey 2 also contains this same error. Surveys 4 and 6 also appear to contain this same error. Please state whether or not this is true.

*see wr
P. N. 1*

Your field notes here for Surveys 2, 4 and 6, Block Q, give the following distances:

For 2, south,	2620	
" 4 "	2979.3	
" 6 "	2497	or 2947
	<u>8096.3</u>	

By records; for 1, south,	2620
" 3 "	2620
" 5 "	1944
	<u>7184</u>
	8096.3

For west line of Block Q	15280.3
Plus 45 to S.E. of Sur. 96	45.0
	<u>15325.3</u>

From N.E. Survey 89 to S.E. Survey 96 is 15504, making a difference 178.7 varas.

Your corrected field notes of Survey 6, Block Q, show the following calls: "Begin at N.W.2 and S.W.1, S. A. & M. G. R. R. being 1900 north from a rock mound set for the S.W. Survey 2 and marked 'S.W.2P'"; Thence west 743 to point in east line Survey 96, Blk. D, 186

R

counter 33979



General Land Office.

State of Texas.

Austin.

J.T. ROBISON, COMMISSIONER.
J.H. WALKER, CHIEF CLERK.

R.S.D. #2

5
north of its S.E. corner, a rock mound marked S.E. 96 from which rock mound S.E. edge of top of high hill bears S. 60 Deg. 35' W., north wooded peak in Sierra Madera bears N. 44 Deg. 40' W., a rock mound bears N. 7 Deg. 42' E. 360 varas; Thence north, at 465 varas a rock mound in the edge of a cedar brush and marked in error 'S.W.6Q', on north at 1714 varas the S.E. Corner of Survey 95 D a rock mound set in a draw from which a small rock mound bears South 19 varas, on north 743 varas, 2497 varas in all to a point in the east line of Survey 95, Block D, and the south line of Survey 5, Block Q; Thence east 743 varas with the south line of Sur. 5 to the S.E. Cor. said Sur. 5 set in the west line of Survey 10, Blk. 108; Thence south, at 365 varas the S.W. Cor. said Sur. 10, at 597 the N.W. Cor. Sur. 1, S. A. & M. G. R.R. on 1900 varas, 2947 in all to the place of beginning--Dec. 1912."

This survey fails to close by 450 varas, the error apparently being in the last course.

Your letter of Aug. 10, 1913, returning corrected field notes of Surveys 4 and 6, Block Q, does not refer to the error in the east line of Block D. Careful search has been made among the records of this office for any report or letter from you stating that an error had been found in your work in Blocks Q and D; made in 1912; and stated in your last report to have been discovered in August, 1913, but no such report or letter can be found. Search was also made among the letters to you from July, 1913, to February, 1914, and no reference of acknowledgment of any such report or letter from you can be found. If you will kindly give the date of this report or the date of letter acknowledging receipt of same it may assist in finding the report.

It appears that corrected field notes for Surveys 2, 4 and 6 in Block Q, conforming to the correction on the east line of Block D, would be necessary. In which instance it would be very desirable to have corrected field notes for all six of these surveys so that this office may be able to check up the entire work and correct the abstract accordingly.

The patented school surveys in Block D which are affected by the correction on the east line of block are 68, 70, 74, 76, 78, 80, 92 and 94. Please state if this is correct.

R
counter 33980



General Land Office.

State of Texas.

Austin.

J. T. ROBISON, COMMISSIONER.
J. H. WALKER, CHIEF CLERK.

R.S.D. #3

6
Field notes of the following surveys previously made by you have already been filed and patents issued thereon: 12; 26; 38; 42; 60; 80, all in Block D; Surveys 24; 26; 28; 32; 34, and 42, in Block C; and 58; 66; 68; 78; 76; 82; 84, in Block A; also the previously mentioned surveys in Block D that are affected by the correction. But it will probably be necessary to file your last corrected field notes of these surveys so that the owners might have the opportunity of having their patents re-issued.

Yours very truly,

Acting Commissioner.

J.W.P./P

R2

counter 33981

: 87 :

Keep With
Pecos County Rolled Sk. "53"
Filed 5-31-16
~~Rel~~ Letter to R.S. Dod

R³

counter 33982

PECOS CO. SA. File # 87

Sketch File No. 87

Pecos County
Dad's R.E. Estes Report of Blks. A, B, C
& D., G.C. & S.F. Ry. Co.

Re-Filed April 22, 1949

BASCOM GILES, Com'r

W. W. Rosenbery
File Clerk

originally Filed with
Pecos County Roll, Sk. "53"
May 31, 1916