



PRESIDIO Co, TEX.
 MAP OF RESURVEY OF SURVEYS 2-4, BL. W. J. G. 4, G. C. & S. F. RY. SHOWING
 CONNECTING LINES AND LOCATIVE OBJECTS OF SURROUNDING AND RE-
 LATED SURVEYS TOGETHER WITH NEW MARKED PIPE CORNERS, AS SURVEYED
 BY W. L. RIDER, LICENSED LAND SURVEYOR, AUG. 2-16, 1928.
 SCALE 1 IN. = 1000 VARAS. VARIATION 12° 45'

I, W. L. RIDER, LICENSED LAND SURVEYOR OF THE STATE OF TEXAS HEREBY CER-
 TIFY THAT THE ABOVE MAP IS PRECISELY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SURVEY MADE
 BY ME ON THE GROUND ON THE DATES AFORESAID AND IS CORRECT.
 GIVEN UNDER MY HAND & SEAL THIS 24TH DAY OF AUGUST, 1928.

W. L. Rider W. L. Rider
 LICENSED LAND SURVEYOR



PRESIDIO Co., TEX.
 MAP OF RESURVEY OF SURVEYS 2-4, BL. W.J.G.4, G.C. & S.F. RY. SHOWING CONNECTING LINES AND LOCATIVE OBJECTS OF SURROUNDING AND RELATED SURVEYS TOGETHER WITH NEW MARKED PIPE CORNERS, AS SURVEYED BY W. L. RIDER, LICENSED LAND SURVEYOR, AUG. 2-16, 1928.
 SCALE 1 IN. = 1000 VARAS. VARIATION 12° 45'.

I, W. L. RIDER, LICENSED LAND SURVEYOR OF THE STATE OF TEXAS HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE ABOVE MAP IS PRECISELY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SURVEY MADE BY ME ON THE GROUND ON THE DATES AFORESAID AND IS CORRECT.
 GIVEN UNDER MY HAND & SEAL THIS 24TH DAY OF AUGUST, 1928.

W. L. Rider W. L. Rider
 LICENSED LAND SURVEYOR

counter 39610

Marfa, Texas.
September 6th, 1928.

Mr. J. T. Robison,
State Land Commissioner,
Austin, Texas.

Dear Sir:-

Following is report on Surveys 2, 3 and 4, Block W. J. G. 4, G. C. & S. F. Ry., Presidio County, for corrected and patent field notes inclosed.

As suggested in your letter of July 16th, I surveyed these three sections in a manner to make them join the west lines of T. C., Block 325, and the Mendosa Survey No. 77, on the East, and made the field notes accordingly. Although I am more thoroughly convinced then ever after my most recent investigations that the original surveyor of Block W. J. G. 4, Mr. Glenn, did not actually reach those lines, and that the excess areas that I have included in these surveys are properly undisclosed vacancies, there being an abundance of evidence on the ground to support that conclusion and none whatever to warrant attaching said excess areas to Block W. J. G. 4.

If after examination of these papers giving the results of my latest work in W. J. G. 4 you agree with us, we would much prefer to have these excess strips recognized and surveyed as scrap land to avoid any controversy in the future and to obtain a more perfect title. If, however, you still insist on the other method of handling them, we seek approval of the inclosed field notes, and as per Mr. Wilson's request inclosed, the granting of patents to the East half of 2, all of 3 on a new patent cancelling the old, and the west portion of 4 out of conflict with any known locations of other surveys. This west portion of 4 slightly exceeds in acreage, the amount purchased, being 331 acres against 320 bought, but Mr. Wilson desires it all if the extra eleven acres can be arranged for. On 2 and 4 I am sending corrected field notes of the sections as a whole, and separate patent field notes on the portions to be patented.

In regard to my field work, I first established the West line of T. C., Block 325, as originally surveyed by Thomson, setting iron pipes at every corner along that line in order to join up the surveys on the West with it. I assumed that Thomson, having surveyed Blocks 200, 325 and 338 all about the same time, had the same block line for all three. This line I picked up by means of Thomson's own corners for the West line of Survey 6, Block 200 (T. & S. L. Ry.) and surveys farther south. On this survey 6, I found Thomson's five large rocks at S. W. corner, one of them marked A. 1 as per field notes. At the N. W. corner, at junction of old Blk. line fences, I found a very large five foot rock md., as called for, but failed to find the old markings. At the middle of the west line of 6, I also found a rock mound, and the West line fence coincided with this line exactly as far south as this mound. At 1908.8 varas

East (N. 89° E) of N. W. corner I found a rock mound in North line fence, said fence fitting the North line all the way. Moreover I found the old road called for in said Section 6 field notes at the proper distances South and East of N. W. corner. Having thus verified Thomson's line beyond peradventure I produced it North to the N. W. corner of Block 325. The old fence which I found on the West line of 6, Block 200, followed my line closely along Block 325, diverging slightly to the West until at its junction with the old South line fence of the old Landrum Survey 313, I found it about five varas west, and at its junction with the old south line fence of the Mendoza Survey 77 and north line fence of Landrum 313, it ended at an unmistakably old fence corner, with the old style grey wires still in evidence and an old rock mound besides, and 8.6 varas west of my line. This small difference I ignored and set my pipe corner for S. E. 77 on the Thomson line at its intersection with south fence line of Mendoza Survey produced. This point measured along the 325 block line 2469.1 varas from the S. W. corner of the block as against 2465 varas in field notes of Survey 6, Block 200. Continuing block line North 950 varas farther, the N. E. corner of the Mendoza fell in the N. E. corner of the agricultural land, which it was undoubtedly the intention of the original Mendoza owners to cover, North and East of the Northeast portion of Mendoza as located by me being rocky hill land. This corner also fell slightly S. E. of an old pile of rocks which may have been Tay's original corner. I made this corner as set my S. E. corner of Survey 3, Block W. J. G. 4. Continuing block line North I set pipe for the N. W. corner of Survey 3, Block 325, at the field note distance of 3932 varas from the S. W. corner of the block on the East bank of Alamito Creek at point which checks precisely the field note bearings to old Landrum house and old spring location, calling the block line true North and South. Both the spring and house are still identifiable and are shown in their proper positions on accompanying map. These bearings are conclusive evidence of the correctness of my location of this corner. Continuing North with Block line, after setting pipe for N. W. corner of 2, Block 325, at its proper distance, I set pipe for the N. E. corner of 3 and lower S. E. corner of 2, Block W. J. G. 4, giving the East line of 3 its field note length of 2509.5 varas. At the N. W. corner of Block 325 I set pipe for N. W. corner of Survey 1, said Block and reentrant corner of Survey 2, Block W. J. G. 4, at the block length of 7060 varas from my starting point, and 3640.9 varas from N. E. corner of Mendoza as against Survey 1 field note distance of 3645. This made the lower East line of said Survey 2, Block W. J. G. 4, 1131.4 varas as against the field note distance of 1128.5 varas. Excepting the S. W. corner of the block and the Mendoza corners, I found no old corners along West line of 325. I then turned Eastly at right angles along the North line of Survey 1, Block 325, and at 608.4 varas only 2.8 varas south of my line I found a large old rock mound, which in connection with other evidence to be considered, I firmly believe to have been Glenn's upper S. E. corner of Survey 2, Blk. W. J. G. 4. I continued however the field note length of 808 varas which fell in

#3.

Alamito Creek, so I placed a reference pipe on the West bank 38.9 varas West of corner. Some other surveyor had done similarly, for I found a small new rock mound on the Creek bank a few varas North of mine. My line continued easterly nearly coincided with a fence along the South line of Ming's survey No. 1363. As Thomson also surveyed the Mings survey, I have given it the same line on my map for its South boundary as Survey 1, Block 325, North line, and given it also its field note length of 1900 varas North, which causes it to overlap the I. & G. N. Survey 904 North of it, which belongs with the G. H. & S. A. Surveys adjoining (original), both having been surveyed by Edwards. The beginning call of the Mings Survey must be erroneous, else Thomson overlapped himself when he surveyed it, which is improbable. Whether or not I am right about the North and South lines of the Mings, this in no way affects the location of Survey 2, Block W. J. G. 4, but its east and west lines do, and I have assumed that Thomson's S. E. corner of the Mings and his N. E. corner of Survey 1, Block 325, are identical without regard to the G. H. & S. A., Block 8, line, and I have placed the S. W. corner of the Mings 1500 varas West of same, according to its field notes and 808 varas East of N. W. corner of 1, as per field notes of 2, Block W. J. G. 4, which fulfills the conditions of all three surveys. In regard to the G. H. & S. A., Block 8, line referred to, I located it without difficulty by its numerous calls, at every corner from the N. W. corner of Survey 311 to the S. W. corner of Survey 314, and giving Block 325 its field note width of 2309 varas from its western boundary as above located the two blocks overlap each other. Thomson's work was done some years before Ammerman's, and his calls for Block 8 must refer therefore to the original Edwards Survey. This overlap is really a convergence of half a degree between Block 8 and Block 325 lines, and Thomson's East line of Block 325 if continued North would intersect the Ammerman line near the N. W. corner of Survey 311, Block 8. At the S. W. corner of Survey 313, Block 8, the two lines are 44.6 varas apart, and the G. H. line checks its own bearings perfectly. From this corner using the G. H. bearings I ran due West and intersected my West boundary of Block 325 as above located at 2263.4 varas, or 44.6 varas less than Block 325 call, proving this to be the difference as stated between the Thomson and Ammerman lines at the S. W. corner of 313. At this point also I checked the direction of the W. block line of Block 325 by my line East from the S. W. corner of 313, and ascertained it to be S. $0^{\circ} 30'$ E., or N. $0^{\circ} 30'$ West, checking my old map which you now have on file within one minute. As in my previous work I have used the G. H. bearings as a basis of all my bearings, especially as I find those at the S. W. corner of 313 agreeing precisely with those at the S. E. corner of 204. In distances E. and W. and N. and S. these two corners do not check, for continuing my tie line W. from S. W. 313 at 3777.7 varas instead of 3800 as should be, I arrived at a point 52.6 varas South of Ammerman's marked S. E. corner of 204, identified **not** only by its markings but by its bearings. Moreover, Ammerman's line northerly

#4.

from this point to his N. E. corner of 204 which I found at 1907.2 varas does not check his bearings, but is N. $0^{\circ} 38' W$ or nearly parallel with Thomson's W. line of Block 325, lacking 8 minutes. This line I accepted for the W. line of 2 and the upper W. line of 3, Block W. J. G. 4, fixing the upper N. W. corner of 3 and the S. W. corner of 2 by squaring the division line between those two sections with the W. line of Block 325 at the N. E. corner of 3 and lower S. E. corner of 2, as above located, and intersecting the E. line of 204 at 289.9 varas N. ($N. 0^{\circ} 38' W$) of S. E. corner of same as against 264.5 varas in the original field notes of 3. This gave a length to the division line between 2 and 3 of 1515.2 varas instead of 1492 as in the old field notes.

For the N. W. corner of 2, Block W. J. G. 4, I extended the East line of 204, following closely a fence most of the way 330.5 varas along the E. line of 205, representing the difference between the field note lengths of said E. line and the W. line of Survey 1, Block W. J. G. 4. This corner fell only 4 varas W. and 3 varas North of intersection of fences on W. and North sides of 2 and very close also to an old rock mound. I then ran E. ($N. 89^{\circ} 30' E.$) parallel to my South lines of 2 for its North line 2327.8 varas, as against the field note length of 2300 varas to the West line of Mings Survey following fence closely all the way and for much of the distance exactly, intersecting the Mings line only 1 vara West and 4 varas N. of intersection of N. and E. fences of 2. There was an old rock mound here also. From this fence corner the E. fence of 2 ran about $S. 0^{\circ} 30' E.$ or parallel with Block 325 line. For a tie I continued the North line of 2 Easterly across the Mings survey 1474.8 varas to its intersection with G. H. & S. A. Block 8 line at a point N. 421.2 varas from N. W. corner of Survey 313, checking closely my line running Westerly from the S. W. corner of same, and further demonstrating a small overlap of Ammerman's location of Block 8 on to Block 325 and the Mings Survey, amounting to about 25 varas at this point. On the N. and lower S. lines of 2, Blk. W. J. G. 4, I established half section corners. At such distances, as indicated on the map, as divide the section into two equal parts and submit herewith corrected field notes for the whole section and patent field notes for the East half.

To determine the Easterly S. line of 3 and the Easterly line of 4 (lower part), W. J. G. 4, I squared the Mendoza Survey 77 with its E. line as above established along the West line of Block 325, making it 950 varas square; its North and South lines fitting the natural conditions as called for of Creek, Cienega and Spring, and covering as doubtless was intended the agricultural lands along both sides of Creek, its S. line following closely old fence with the S. corner falling close to old rock mound, its north line serving for the Easterly S. line of 3, and its West line for the East line of 4, (lower part). I also referenced its N. W. corner in Survey 3 field notes to U. S. bench mark at Penitas Ranch house for a permanent land mark, as well as to the

#5.

old spring with no longer flows, owing to the lowering of the creek and the digging of an artificial spring above it on Survey 3.

For the lower W. line of 3, I accepted the E. line of 5 same block, as identified by its bearings at its N. E. corner at a rock mound 246 varas W. from S. E. corner of 204 Block 8, where its bearings do not fit; and by rock mound at its S. E. corner on E. side of a hill as called for in field notes of Survey 4, and which also checks natural calls one mile and two miles ~~xxxx~~ West as shown on map. A point 1 mile South of S. E. corner of 204 for this S. E. corner of 5 would fall on the W. side of the hill, and is therefore out of question. The bearings at the rock mound accepted by me as the true N. E. corner of 5 check as regards the angle between them, but do not check the G. H. bearings at the S. E. corner of 204, in fact there is a difference between them on the ground of $1^{\circ} 13'$. It must be borne in mind that Glenn, the original surveyor of W. J. G. 4, like Thomson, made his survey before Ammerman resurveyed Block 8, and in calling for Block 8 undoubtedly referred to the original lines of Edwards, which apparently were different from Ammerman's. Three and four miles W. of the S. E. corner of 204 I found two old rock mounds a mile apart and west of Ammerman's marked corners for the S. line of Survey 98, Block 8, about the same amount as the N. E. corner of 5 is West of the S. E. corner of 204. These old corners were shown to me by County Commissioner, Jap Bishop, who was on the ground when Ammerman made his survey, and he says that they were there before Ammerman's time. They must be Edward's corners, not Glenn's, for W. J. G. Survey No. 19 adjoining is far in excess of a mile long between its North corners. But Glenn's N. W. 19 is probably identical with the Westerly line of these mounds, for there he calls for a rock mound on a hill 200 varas S. with bearings, and there is such a hill and one of the bearings checks at 200 varas S., while there is no hill at all immediately South of Ammerman's marked S. W. 98 S. E. 97. Finally as regards these corners of Survey 5, course and distance between them check closely, being N. $0^{\circ} 15'$ West 1909.4 varas. As the N. E. corner was 2 varas North of a line running West from the S. E. corner of 204 along an old fence, I set my pipe corner 2 varas south of the old five corner for a new corner, shortening the division line between three and five to 1907.4 varas to fit the G. H. line. The old rock mound at this corner is mentioned in the field notes of Survey 204 as being 390 varas E. of an old road, and 210 varas W. of the S. E. corner of 204. The former distance checks today, the old road still being in evidence, but the latter distance is 226 varas as shown on my map. Ammerman located this old mound, but failed to recognize it as Edward's corner, though Glenn appears to have done so some years earlier.

There remains but one corner of 3, W. J. G. 4, to be explained, the reentrant southerly corner which is also the N. E. corner of 4, same block. Having fixed the N. W. corner of the Mendoza for the lower S. W. corner of 3, and the S. E. corner of 5, for the upper S. W. corner of 3, I simply extended the West line

#6.

of the Mendoza North $0^{\circ} 30'$ West until it intersected at right angles S. $89^{\circ} 30'$ West, a line to Said S. E. corner of 5, making the extension of the Mendoza line 314.3 varas, and consequently the E. Line of 4, 1264.3 varas and the Westerly S. line of 3 from the N. E. corner of 4 to the S. E. corner of 5, 835.7 varas. These two lines of 3 in original field notes were 345 and 342 varas respectively. The shortage in the former was compensated so far as survey 3 is concerned by the excess in the course between the S. E. corner of 204 and the upper N. W. corner of 3. The big excess in the latter is due to extending 3 and 4 Easterly to fit block 325 and the Mendoza, while leaving 5 intact. It is significant that 307.8 varas west of this new location of the N. E. corner of 4, at which there was no evidence of a corner, I found an old rock mound 5.5 varas North of my line which I believed to be Glenn's N. E. 4, because it measures 2440.3 varas east from another Rock mound found at the joint corner of 4, 5, 6, and 7 at point of small hill as called for, as against field note call of 2442 varas for the North line of 4, said rock mound at said joint corner being in turn 1910.4 varas east of another found amongst some small hills as called for, and recognized by the owners as S. W. 6, N. W. 7. ~~xxxx~~
~~xxxx~~ Our new length for the N. line of 4 is 2748 varas.

For the W. line of 4, I surveyed from old rock mound, above mentioned, at its N. W. corner S. $0^{\circ} 31'$ W. 3809.6 varas to an old rock mound at its S. W. corner and S. E. corner of 8 same block, which latter corner I found to be S. $88^{\circ} 58'$ West, 71 varas, field note distance, from another large old rock mound "in a hollow" as called for, ~~xxx~~ being the S. E. corner of 4 and N. E. corner of 9, W. J. G. 4, 365 varas at right angles Westerly of an old fence, bearing S. 10° West, and marking the Westerly line of Hanson survey 1460 as called for in field notes of ~~xx~~ R. R. Ellison Survey No. 1. I then returned to half way point in valley between two hills and set the S. E. corner of 7 and N. E. corner of 8 in West line of 4. This corner could not be much farther east, because the valley in which it is situated and which is mentioned in the records does not extend any great distance easterly.

For the reentrant corner of 4 at the N. W. corner of Ellison Survey and the remaining lines of 4, I used the Ellison bearings of N. $9^{\circ} 45'$ East from the aforesaid rock mound in a hollow, intersecting it with a line at right angles or S. $80^{\circ} 15'$ East to the S. E. corner of Mendoza Survey No. 77. This gave lengths in excess of the field notes of both 4 and the Ellison survey for both lines, and put the upper S. line of 4 on the North side of the old fence that has always been recognized as its south boundary and makes this line coincide with the N. line of Survey 12, Block 9, H. & T. C. according to my location of the same. For the whole of section 4 corrected field notes accompany this report, excluding the Gibson survey, and for the west portion out of conflict with any known locations of other surveys or surveyors patent field notes. In order to determine the lines of this West portion it was necessary to locate the Gibson survey No. 1473 which was easily done through its natural calls on its Easterly boundary, where I found the rock

counter 34616

#7.

mound North of some little hillocks at head of small draw for the Northeast corner of the tract and the various "branches" at their proper distances where they cross the east line. This survey 1473 conflicts with survey 5, Block W. J. G. 4, to the extent of three acres as shown. At the intersection of its Westerly line with the S. line of 5, I established the upper N. E. corner of the west portion of 4, and then followed the Westerly line of 1473 to its S. W. corner; thence its southerly line to its S. E. corner; thence along its easterly line produced southerly along the West line of Survey 12, block 9, H. & T. C., as located by Reavis, to its intersection with the upper S. line of 4, as above described. Reavis' west and south lines of 12 I have verified beyond question by his natural calls and rock mound corners and investigation of field notes will show that the Gibson East line and the Reavis west line of 12 are identical, and as my patent field notes of W. part of 3 are entirely W. of this line and outside of Gibson and Ellison lines, as well as my own location of 12, they are entirely in the clear of any known locations of other surveys.

Attention is called to the broken lines shown on E. and W. sides of surveys 1 and 2, and the E. side of Surveys 3 and 4, W. J. G. 4, as indicating the original lines of those surveys, based on the rock mounds found at 307.8 varas west of corrected N. E. corner of 4, at 246 varas West of S. E. corner of 204, Block 8, and at 199.6 varas West of S. W. corner of Mings Survey 1363. ^{The} Second ~~of~~ these points is 907.4 varas N. of the first and the third is 1421.3 varas N. of the second, indicating a proportional convergence northerly of about $32\frac{1}{2}$ varas per 1000 varas, which expressed in degrees is $1^{\circ} 52'$. At the south line of 204 we found a difference between Glenn's and Ammerman's meridian based on their bearings to mountain peaks of $1^{\circ} 15'$, which added to Ammerman's bearing for the E. line of 204 of N. $0^{\circ} 38' W.$ makes $1^{\circ} 51'$, or added to Thomson's bearing of Block 325, West line, of N. $0^{\circ} 30' W.$, makes $1^{\circ} 43'$; which results are strikingly close to the above convergence of the three rock mounds referred to with reference to the same lines of Ammerman and Thomson. It is plain that this convergence would close farther north, and it may represent a difference between the original and corrected east lines of surveys 204, 205, etc. This proportional convergence of these three rock mounds together with the finding of so many other rock mounds in Block W. J. G. 4, fitting courses, distances and natural calls, all on the Westerly location, and the failure to find any monuments of consequence on the Easterly lines, all point strongly to the correctness of the presumption that Glenn did not reach Block 325 or the Mendoza, and that his calls for the latter were mistaken calls. He could not and did not call for Block 325 because it was not in existence, and Block 325's single impossible call at the N. W. corner of its Survey 1 for the N. E. corner of Survey 2, Block W. J. G. 4., must give way to the location of Thomson's block line on the ground.

counter 34617

#8.

Such are my reasons for still recommending a reconsideration of your decision not to allow the existance of vacancies along the E. sides of 2, 3 and 4, W. J. G. 4, and as an alternative only to what I believe to be the proper course ~~explained~~ the enclosed field notes are submitted.

Respectfully yours,

W. L. Rider

Licensed Land Surveyor.

WLR:DB

counter 34618

file No. 53

Presidio County

Explanation

~~Field Notes~~

filed Sept 10 1928

J. T. Robison Com'r.

H. F. McDonald

File Clerk