

Recd 6/12/27
Blanchard
Austin Tex.
June 12 '27

Mr. J. T. Robinson
State Land Commissioner
Austin, Tex.

Dear Sir: Following is a report of investigation made by me in April and May this year for Mr. T. W. Wilson of Marfa, Tex. to determine the correct location of lands owned and controlled by him being part of the Penitencia Ranch so called on the waters of Alamitos Creek, Presidio Co., with a view to their proper adjustment by the Land Office, and the sale to him of certain fractional sections that have been withheld from sale because of certain supposed conflicts, and of other tracts that appear to be vacant scrap lands, for which latter a title of inquiry will be forthcoming.

The lines which I have attempted to locate are those of Block 9, H. & T. C. by sections 7 to 12 inclusive and surrounding surveys ~~and~~ in Presidio Co. The particular fractional surveys which Mr. Wilson desires to purchase are the unsold portions of section 4, Bl. W. S. G. 4, T. C. & S. T. by; section 12, Bl. 9, H. & T. C. by; sec 2, Bl. 338 T. C. by. The supposed vacant strips are believed to lie east of sections 2, 3 and 4 of said Bl. 4.

2
S. E. ~~and~~ ^{also} section 5 of said Bl. 338
as patented and ^{also} N. W. ~~also~~ of said section
5 if my location of said Bl. 9 is approved.
Moreover Mrs. Wilson wishes to settle the
question of priority of patents to knowledge
Ers. 77 Landrum Ers. 313, Burgess Ers 317,
Gerrys 1 and 3 of said Bl. 338, surveys
9 and 11 of Block 9 H. & T. C. all of which
appear to be partially covered by the
Beavis reserve of said Block 9 and the
Hanson and Ellison tracts which were awarded
as scrap land after the said reserve, the
Hanson tract having subsequently been pat-
ented.

My investigations to determine the
facts in regard to these matters cover
a period of nearly two months and
and are as complete I believe as the
records on file and the evidence on the
ground will permit, and are not based
on any single fact or field note call
as in the reserve of Block 9, but represent
an effort to approach the problem from
every possible angle with conclusions based
on the sum total of the information thus
obtained.

~~From~~ My first work was to search
the records on file at Manassas for all data
that might be of use to me, and find
under 34591

3 this date I compiled a preliminary map which I submit with this report.

The records alone convinced me and I think prove ~~that~~ without any survey that prior to Mrs. Reavis' survey there existed no conflicts of any consequence between any of the surveys involved in this investigation, and that Mrs. Reavis tie between his N. E. corner of Secs. 11 Block 9th & T. C. to the N. E. corner of the Bourgeois survey 317 is inconsistent with Mrs. Papp call for a joint corner at the S. W. corner of the land (or North corner of the Bourgeois) and the N. E. corner of Sec. 12 said Bl. 9, bearing in mind that Mrs. Papp surveyed both 77 and 12 within 12 days of each other; and ~~simple~~ ~~plot~~ ~~will~~ as my preliminary map shows, placing them in ~~these~~ position that Mrs. Papp call for does not admit of any overlapping of 12 or 77 as necessitated by the conditions of the Reavis survey. The records show furthermore that Reavis locations ~~of~~ ~~Block 9~~ ~~is~~ ^{are} opposed ^{to} those of Mrs. Thomson who surveyed Block 338 and 325 T. C. Ry and Bl. 200 T. & S. Ry. lying easterly of the Reavis survey; to Mrs. Annemann's survey of Bl. 5, T. H. Ry. S. A. Ry. northerly and northeasterly;

to Mrs. Glaines survey of Block W. V. E. 4
 4. C. & S. G. on the West and north and
 Gurney 799 and 800 on the south; and
 to Mrs. Gilberts survey of ^{sections} 581 and 582
 T. C. G. on the south. Mrs. ~~Macmor~~
~~one~~ who located the Hanson survey 1460
 in a portion of the strip vacated by Mrs.
 Reavis, being part of the west side of
 Block 9 as Mrs. Tays located it, ~~is~~ recognizes
 the south and east lines of Block 9 as
 Mrs. Tays located them for the south and
 east lines of the Hanson survey in the
 portion lying south west of the recovery
 of Block 9; and last of all, Mrs. Farmer
 who located the Ellison survey ~~in Mrs. Glaines~~
~~line~~ accepts Mrs. Tays N. W. ~~and S. W. ~~corners~~~~
 corners ^{of Bl. 9} for the N. & S. limits of the Ellison
 tract.

Mrs. Reavis then is not in agreement
 with any of the surveys of lands involved
 in this investigation from Tays to Farmer.
 The records show that he relied on
 one point only, his S. E. cor. ^{of Bl. 9}
 which calls for a hill E. of a road
 as does Mrs. Tays S. E. cor. ^{of Bl. 9}
 and claims it to be Mrs. Tays corner,
 a conclusion based ^{apparently} on hearsay evidence
 obtained by another surveyor ^{Mrs. Shelby} whose
 location he accepts without further veri-
 fication. Mrs. Reavis' call on the south
 line of Survey 7 Bl. 9, show there was

5 another road further west which could
have been the one called for by Mrs. Dags.
The records show also, accepting Mrs. ~~Reavis~~^{Dags}
location of the ~~Reavis~~ ~~Survey~~ ~~367~~ ~~and~~ ~~spring~~
Munday - 12 joint corner, that if
Mrs. Dags had referred to the more
easterly of these two roads it would
have placed his S. E. cor. of Block
9 far south of Mrs. Reavis location
of same and caused his survey
of 7 Bl. 9 to overlap the Davis survey
which he surveyed himself a few
years before he surveyed 7. Further -
more it would have given Block
9 a different direction from north
to south from the field notes.
If then the problem were ^{but} to prove Mrs.
Reavis wrong, the records do that.
But to determine the true location of
Mrs. Dags lines is a separate problem
requiring a survey on the ground. First
this I made, determining his location,
from conditions within his Munday Survey
such as his call for the cinnega and
the spring, the ruins of the old munday
house still in evidence, old fences still
in evidence on the south and east sides
of the tract, ~~not~~ ~~removed~~ ~~corners~~ ~~which~~ I
found at all four corners substantially
corner 39594

6 in agreement as to course and distance
these checking other rock corners that I
found at three corners of Bl 9 and old
fences on the west and north lines of same
accepting the Dags field notes for both
surveys: secondly, from verified corners
of outlying surveys including the S.W.
corner of survey 204 Bl. 8 9. H. & S. A. Ry where
I found a rock mound on an E. & W. fence ~~with~~
marked S-E. 204 which checked its bearings and
old road as per field notes; the S.W. corner
of Sur. 314 same block where I found a rock
mound in a N. & S. fence marked S.W. 314; the
N.E., N.W. and S.W. corners of Sur. 6. Bl. 200, T.C. Ry.
which were monumented and connected by fence
and which checked each other closely by course
and distance, and also by the old road as per
field notes, the S.W. corner consisting of 5 large
rocks subd. "A-1" as recorded; the N.W.
corner of Sur. 581 T.C. where I found a rock
mound in a ^{N. and S} fence ~~with~~ All these checked
by connecting surveys my location of the
Dags surveys 77 and Bl. 9 and checked
each other also within close limits.
In all the above I found no material
change from the records as shown on
my preliminary map.

7 I also found the ^{of Bl. 4 W. d. 4-} und. corners which verified
 these natural cells and checked each
 other closely on course and distances
 at the N.E. cor. of Section 9, the S.W., N.W.,
 and N.E. corners of Section 7, the S.E.
 and N.E. corners of Section 5
 and the N.E. corner of Section 4.
 These corners of Bl 4 verified the
 Farmers location of the E. line of
~~Bl 4~~ the block and of the narrow portion
 of the Ellison Survey and indicated
 a continuation of that strip westerly
 along the east lines of Sections 4, 3
 and 2 creating the vacant strip mentioned
 above. They show that Mr Ellison did
 not ascertain the true west lines of
 Bl 9 and the Mondays - but placed
 them farther west than I place them.

I also retraced the Hanson Survey
 by its calls and monuments and found
 rock mounds at its north corners, fences
 on the East, West and north lines, and
 rock mounds along its East line at mile
 intervals for ^{remains of} Heavis W corners of Bl 9 survey
 which aligns Heavis' S.E. corner of T. 4 as I found it on a hill E of old road
 and I traced these to Heavis N. W. corner
 of said survey ^{of Sec 2 Bl 9} and found every rail
 on T. 24596

and N. 50° W. 2.60 ft. from survey pt. N.E. corner
 of Davis Sec. 200 298

as called for in the line west line
 of 12 and the east line of Gibson
 survey 1473 besides the fence which
 he and the surveyor of 1473 both ad-
 mit they found on the old north
 line of survey 12 as I locate it.
 In the field notes of 1473 this fence
 is called the Norman and Mogan
 fence and so it was, and it is
 there today marking the north line
 of Sur. 12 Bl. 9 and the south
 line of the Menadoga or Rays lines.
 My location of the Hanson survey
 shows it to be entirely in con-
 flict with Rays location of Block
 9 and as also that portion of
 the Ellison survey lying directly
 north of it. The Gibson survey
 I find entirely in conflict with
 Sur 4, Block W. S. 3. 4, G. C. & S. 7.
 Said Sur. 4 Bl. 4 is partly in conflict
 with ^{the north part of} Survey 12 Bl. 9 as located by Mr. Rays.
 All the above facts are shown on my
 final map which also accompanies
 this report.

W. L. Alder
 Licensed Land Surveyor

Sketch File No. "R"

Presidio County

Report of Surveys

By W.L. Rider

Filed June 13 1927

~~WM. H. McDONALD, Com'r~~

~~J. T. Robinson~~

3/25/38 Woodland
File Clerk

Descriptive: Report Filed
with Presidio Co. Rolled
Sk. No. "W.R." & "W.R.-1"

For Typed Copy of this
Report see Sk. File "R.1"

See Rolled Sketches.
"W.R." & "W.R.-1"