

Report on a resurvey in  
Block 23, G.H. & S.A. Ry. Co. Blk. 330 T.T. Ry. Co.  
Block W.J.G.2, and Block C 3,  
Presidio County Texas  
by R.S. Dod, State Sur.

950

See sketch by  
R.S. Dod, dated  
1-9-1919  
Roll sketches

RECEIVED

APR 5 1919

Referred to Map

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

Dear Sir,

In accordance with your Letter of Instructions to me as State Surveyor, dated March 21 1919, I went on the ground and made the following survey, the details of which are hereby respectfully submitted for your consideration.

The data for the survey were a Working sketch of the Blocks of land in question, kindly furnished by your Office, dated 11-30-14, in connection with instructions to resurvey Section 18 Blk 330, at the request of Will Burford under his application to purchase.

This resurvey was made and reported to your Office, and some of the connections made on that survey by me as State Surveyor and reported at that time are used in this survey.

On looking over the field notes of Blk 23 G.H. & S.A. Ry. Co. we find that the present field notes are those of a resurvey made by Mr. Mabry as State Surveyor in 1889, but the original location and survey are much earlier.

We note a line of marked corners running North and South <sup>west</sup> one mile from the East line of Blk 23, but no marked corners called for on the east line. The particular surveys in question, No. 6, 14, & 22, can be located from their corners on the above noted line.

At the S.E. cor sur 21 Blk 23 we found a large rock mound and a lone cedar S 29° 30' E, and a cedar stump corresponding to the call for the other cedar bearing in the field notes for the S.E. cor sur 21.

Running South at 1920 we passed a rock mound (recent) on at 2750 reached an old rock mound with a pointed Pk. N 38° 15' E, corresponding to call at S.E. cor sur 14, On south 1900 varas to point for N.E. cor sur 7, Here we found no rock mound, but 520 varas west found a large mound marked for the corner, and on the east side of an arroyo, but no mountain bearings to fit the call in the field notes.

We went west to a fence corner where we found a rock mound and a dyke or natural rock mound, and small rocky standing as called for in Mabry's field notes for S.W. 7. Measuring back east, at 1380 reached the large marked mound, on at 1900 reached a point on the east side of an arroyo near where our line from the north passed, and from which two mountain peaks bore as called for N 30° 15' E and N 27° W. This point was 19.5 varas south of distance from north.

From this point we ran south, at 900 varas and 1000 varas crossing a dry creek, on at 1900 varas found a rock mound on south side of creek a little east of our line, <sup>1500 south</sup> from which the west edge of a low rock bluff bears N 31° 30' W and a rough hill bears N 38° 30' E. this fits the calls at this corner, except that the field notes call for the Bluff as south west, instead of N.W. an impossible call at this point as one can not see south more than 50 varas from the corner on account of the ridge to the south along the north edge of which the creek runs.

On South at 1904 varas we found a large mound of black rock near the east edge of a high rough hill, one rock marked "SE 4".

To determine the actual position of these east line of these surveys, and the relative position of surveys in Block W.J.G.2, we went to the N.E. cor of sur 25 in that Block, marked by a large, old, rock mound on the north side of a hill near the top, from which the monument on St. Andrews bears N 56° E, and the stump of a large cedar at the foot of the hill on east side of a drain bears N 16° 30' E 324 varas, fitting Mr. Glenn's field notes for this corner.

From this N.E. cor sur 25 we ran west and at 942 varas passed a rock mound in a drain, said to have been placed by Mr. Tarver as Dep. Co. Sur. of Presidio Co. for the N.W. cor sur 25, on 1900 varas, 2842 varas in all we reached a point 20 varas north of the S.E. cor sur 21 as above described.

The variation given by the bearings at NE 25 was the same as found between corners in Blk, 23.

The above connection showed a conflict of 958 varas between west line of Blk. W.J.G.2 and the east line of Blk. 23, the senior location, leaving surveys in Blk. 23 their full 640 acres each, and only 317 acres each in surveys 25, 26, 31, 32, & 22, Blk, W.J.G.2

Noting what your letter of instructions says with regard to surveys already patented in Blk. W.J.G.2 that might conflict with state surveys in Blk. 23, I would say that I understand that Mr. Pool owns surveys 25 & 31

R

and bought and holds them as 317 acres each.

There appear to be no other marked corners in Blk.W.J.G.2 so course and distance from the north east corner of 25 will govern.

Returning to the rockmound described above at SW corner of 5 Blk.23 and running one mile east we find that survey 5 conflicts with survey 33 to the extent of 1029 varas in northing and 942 varas in easting. But also we find that the east line of 21 & 22 J.Hardiman conflicts 16.3 varas in easting with wbl 33 as described below leaving only 461.5 acres in 33

At the time we made the survey for Burford in December 1914 we found that the two Hardiman 160 acre tracts were not on the ground where shown by the county map and where placed by Mr.Brooks in his resurvey of 13 Blk, 330 and Hemphill 468 in 1906.

These surveys 21 & 22 J.Hardiman are described as lying on Las Moras creek the tributary of the Cibolo which flows through Shafter. Las Moras creek is well known, it is a spring branch, and on the creek is an old farm and orchard settled a long time ago. In 1914 I drove over to Las Moras (or the Moritas) and found an old rockmound on a large flat rock from which a dead cotton wood stump about 4 feet high with an old X and hack stood on the west bank of Las Moras creek N 50° W 71 varas from the rock mound. On this survey we ran from the intersection of sbl 5 and wbl 33 to this original S W cor.21, but the mound was gone and the cottonwood washed away. Mr.Dawson, who owns surveys 21 & 22 was with us and showed us a point where S.A.Thompson had told Dawson that this corner was. About 10 steps from this point I relocated the flat rock and on examining the west bank of the creek N 50° W 71 varas we found part of the roots of a cotton wood. This I think fixes definitely the SW cor.of sur.21.

From this corner we ran east 950 varas and made a rockmound for SE cor of 21. Ran north and at 1543 varas reached the south line of 5 and placed a rockmound at the intersection of these lines. Ran on 357 varas, 1900 varas in all and set a rockmound for the NE cor.of sur .22

Returning to the south west corner of survey 5 we ran east at 8 varas crossed the west line of sur.22, on east at 765.7 varas placed a rockmound for the NE cor. of the west 1/2 of survey 2 Blk.C 3 Giles Upton. We found a rockmound set by Mr.Tarver for the division line of Giles Upton about 20 steps NE., on east 942 varas placed rockmound for NW 33 on sbl sur.5, on 16.3 varas east reach rockmound set on east line of survey 32 J.Hardiman.

From the NW corner of sur .33 we ran south at 871 varas passed the SW cor.of sur.33 on at 2771 varas set rockmound on the southeast slope of a rough hill for the SW cor. of sur.34.

The east line of Giles Upton calls to be 1000 varas east of SW cor.of 5, while we find the west line of 33 & 34 to be only 942 varas east of the same corner. consequently Giles Upton conflicts with 33 & 34 58 varas in easting. The east line of Giles Upton calls to run south 2480 varas while the west line of 33 & 34 runs 2771 varas hence the south line of sur.34 conflicts with the north line of the east part of Giles Upton 291 varas in southing.

The north line of the east part of Giles Upton calls to run east 1990 varas hence it will pass the east line of sur.34 by the extent of conflict on the west viz.58 varas and will conflict with sur.14 a junior survey by its corrected field notes.

The east boundry line of Giles Upton calls to run south 1389 varas, which leaves 1098 varas of the Giles Upton south of the south line of survey 34. This will conflict with sur 14 and with sur.28 W.P.Couch, both junior surveys. The location of Giles Upton depends solely on the SW cor, sur.5 and course and distance. W.P.Couch depends on its connections with the original SE corner of 767, now 661 south and 375 varas west of NE corner of 767 by correction of S.A.Thompson ~~XXXXX~~ 2/5/86.

Presumeing that the west 1/2 of survey 2 would be controlled by the original field notes and contain 640 acres of the original 1280 acres regardless of conflict, then the east 640 acres will lose to the senior surveys 21, 22, 33, & 34, leaving 454 acres in the east 1/2 of survey 2 Blk C 3.

Survey 14 Blk.330 calls to begin at the SW corner of survey 12 of the same block and was corrected by Mr.Thompson in 1884. It calls for survey 28 and the course of its NE line N45°W 1344 varas evidently means the SW line of 468. The call for survey 28 takes us back to the old corner of survey 767. It would seem proper to give survey 14 its calls on the east and let it lose on the west which reduces the acreage from 640 to 370.6 acres.

Survey 10 Blk.330 depends on the NE corner of survey 25 same block.

This connection was run and reported in 1914 and gives the actual position of survey 10, 9, & 13, on the ground and relative position of surveys 329, 330 & 468.

In considering this connection it is to be remembered that Mr. Brooks put in the Hemphill on the ground based on Marmion's resurvey of 329 & 330. The old house and farm put in on the Cienega on 329 in 1875 are still used and together with the corners described in a former report (1914) definitely fix these surveys on the ground, but Mr. Brooks also supposed that the Hardiman surveys would lie as shown on the county map from their call 10 miles S 45° E from survey 18, and when his attention was called to the fact that they called for Las Moras creek and were and had been occupied, he said that the map and call from 18 would hold and the surveys lie on the Cienega.

This might be possible were it not for the actual occupation of these surveys on Las Moras from the time of their location. Mr. S.A. Thompson recognized the Las Moras location and my investigation on the ground in 1914 confirms this as the true original location of the Hardiman surveys.

This confusion between the location on the county map based on original connecting calls in the field notes and the actual position on the ground ~~leads to~~ as determined by the original corners of the surveys leads to serious conflict between the A.B. & M. surveys 329 & 330 and survey 468 and the surveys in W.J.G. 2, as formerly reported and as shown on the sketch accompanying this report, and this is further complicated by the corrected survey of section 13 made by Mr. Brooks in 1906, placing it in conflict with surveys in its own block.

Survey 10 calls to begin on 9, 9 on 7, 7 on 3 F.R., 3 on 4, 4 on 1, 1 on 2, 2 on 19, 19 on 20, and 20 has its own original NW corner. This connection was run and the result, as plotted on the sketch, leaves 10 in conflict with 330, 468, & sur. 13 leaving 404.6 acres in survey 10 as shown by the accompanying field notes.

You will note that the field notes of sur 10 and of sur 14 show that survey 13 was supposed and intended by Mr. Brooks to occupy the tract east of survey 14, which is now apparently, unoccupied, and unsurveyed State land.

Some time ago I suggested to Mr. Pert that he take the matter of the location of sur 13 with the Land Office and suggested that as its present position was not under the original field notes but under Mr. Brooks incorrect correction, that the Gen. Land Office might cancel this patent and reissue under original field notes.

He told me that he had taken the matter up with your Office and that he was told nothing could be done to correct the error.

If this is correct, then the space east of 14 is unsurveyed land, and if so Mr. Poole would like to make application to the County surveyor for a survey with intent to purchase. Will you kindly take this matter under consideration and notify me as to your decision in the matter.

I have made corrected field notes for the Giles Upton in two parts, one for the west 1/2 and one for the east 1/2, as a matter of convenience, as Mr. Dawson stated that he had purchased the west half, and Mr. Poole told me he had applied to purchase the east 1/2.

I think the above report, together with the facts given in my former report on resurvey of section 18 Blk 330, will give all the data necessary to a full understanding of the facts as we found them, but if there is anything lacking, kindly let me know and I will try to supply it.

Respectfully submitted

*R.S. Dod*  
State Surveyor

*Alpine Tex  
ap. 3 1919*

Box 2

Sketch File No. #50

Presidio County

Dad's Report, Blks. 23-

330 - W.V.G. - C. 3

Filed April 5, 1919

Descriptive:

2

county 34589

Dated 4-3-19

Sketch File No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Presidio County  
 Filed April 5th <sup>1919</sup>  
J. H. Walker, Comptroller  
 File Clerk

Descriptive: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Respectfully submitted

*J. H. Walker*  
State Surveyor

*W. V. G. - C. 3*

R<sup>3</sup>