

Sketch file No. 30B

Start County

May's sketch

Along N. lines Porciones 77-88

Filed August 23rd 1935

J. H. Walker, Comm.

C. F. Blucher

File Clerk

Descriptive: 11 Mi. N30°E Rio Grande City

See Sk. File 30A for sketch

OFFICE OF  
J. H. MAY  
County Surveyor and Engineer  
RIO GRANDE CITY, TEXAS

Rec'd 8/23/35  
from J. H. May

counter 36954

To the  
Hon. J.H.Walker,  
Commissioner General Land Office.

August 12, 1935.

Report of a re-survey of  
Surveys 933 and 934, and the North lines  
of Porciones 82 to 87 inclusive; also exist-  
ing Vacancies lying between Porciones and  
Surveys.

Starr County, Texas.

Object of survey, to determine by actual survey on the ground, the true location or lines of surveys 933 and 934, and any existing vacancies between Porciones 82 to 87 and the surveys to the North.

Surveyed on application of F. Davenport to me as County Surveyor of Starr County, Texas, for a survey to lease vacancies between said Porciones and Surveys; and an order to re-survey surveys 933 and 934, by virtue of his ownership.

Date for survey, from a working sketch compiled from the archives of the General Land Office, giving field notes to Porciones 75 to 90, and the surveys to the North.

From records of the County Surveyors of Starr County, and the report of R. D. Dod, Licensed Surveyor, of Jan., 1921.

Survey was made with a Transit with front and Back sights, all angles checked by the needle. Distances were measured with a new 100 ft., Chicago Steel Tape, converted to Varas.

After examining the old field notes and the report of R. S. Dod, and a thorough search on the ground, I came to the conclusion that the only point on the south part of the Porciones between Porcion 80 and 90, was the Stone on line between Porcions 83 and 84, I re-traced R. S. Dod's line.

Beginning at stone (said stone being N. 9° E. 1287 vs. from North bank of the Rio Grande at this time, and 76.1 vs. from the High Bank or North limits of the overflow.)

Thence N. 9° E. with old lane at 2283.3 vs. cross old Brownsville road, at 2331.9 vs. cross State Highway No. 4, at 2473.2 vs. cross Rail-road, at 17300 vs. cross old Corpus Christi road, at 24691.1 vs found old stump and marked tree to the West as called for in R. S. Dod report.

Not checking the distances as called in Dod report, I rechaind

W  
/

counter 36955

my line back to the stone and found it correct.

In Trimbl's field notes he calls for the Brownsville road to be 2400 vs. North of the S.W. corner of Porcion 84 and S.E. corner of Porcion 83. I find the High bank to be 2359.3 vs. South of the old Brownsville road, so, assuming that the old high bank has been cut away by floods, 40.7 vs. would make Trimble old corner on the high bank and 2400 vs. South of the old Brownsville road.

Assuming the old Brownsville road correct, I placed the N.W. corner of Porcion 84, 21500 vs. North of the road and the N.E. corner of Porcion 83, 22485 vs. North of road, as Trimble calls.

Thence I ran N.80°45'W. at 2649 vs. found the East line of Porcion 81 (as partitioned by the District Court in June 1926) S.9° 08' W. 2624.4 vs. from a large stone, recognized by the District Court as the N.E. corner of Porcion 81.

Finding that I had an excess of 49 vs. from the N.E. corner of Porcion 83 to the East line of Porcion 81, I return to the N.E. corner of Porcion 83 as first placed and move it 49 vs. N.80°45'W. giving Porcion 82 and 83 1300 vs. each as Trimble calls.

Thence from the N.E. corner of Porcion 83, I ran S.9°15'W. 985 vs. and re-established the N.W. corner of Porcion 84. Thence following Trimble calls, S.80°45'E. 1300 vs. placed the N.E. corner of Porcion 84. Thence S.9°15'W. 1335 vs. placed the N.W. corner of Porcion 85. Thence S.80°45'E. 1300 vs. placed the N.E. corner of Porcion 85. Thence S.9°15'W. at 620 vs. placed the N.W. corner of Porcion 86, said corner being 2.3 vs. East of an old fence recognized as Porcion line. Thence S.80°45'E. at 1300 vs. placed the N.E. corner of Porcion 86. Thence S.9°15'W. 685 vs. placed the N.W. corner of Porcion 87. Thence S.80°45'E. at 1062.0 vs. placed the N.E. corner of Porcion 87 in old fence running to the Rio Grande, and recognized by the District Court in the Partition of Porcion 88 as the Porcion line.

Said N.E. corner of Porcion 87 being N.8°38'E. 855.0 vs. from the N.W. corner of Porcion 88, as established by the District Court. Call by Trimble in the Survey of Porciones 86 and 87, 4 years after the survey of the adjoining Porciones to be 100 vs. North of Porcion 88. Trimble survey of Porcion 87 does not call for anything to the South that can be found, and the West line of Porcion 88 being 306.4

vs. short of the call of Trimble from the Brownsville road, by actual measurement, I assumed that Trimble had an error in his Calls.

Completing my survey of the North lines of the Porciones 82, 83, 84, 85, 86 and 87, I go to the 4" x 4" Mesquite post mkd. 163 N. W., as called for in the report of R. S. Dod, and ran with the fence S.  $9^{\circ} 01' W.$  985 vs. to the fence corner. Thence with fence S.  $80^{\circ} 45' E.$  1300 vs. found an old corner fence post where placed new corner for a corner of Survey 933 and 163. Thence with old fence posts (wire gone) S.  $9^{\circ} 15' W.$  1335 vs. to an old post mkd. 163 S. W. Thence S.  $80^{\circ} 45' E.$  at 1004 vs. found old post mkd. 163 S. E. at 1300 vs. found old post for a corner of Surveys 933 and 164. Thence S.  $9^{\circ} 15' W.$  620 vs. to an old post mkd. 164 S. W. for the N. W. corner of Survey 934. Thence S.  $80^{\circ} 45' E.$  at 1069.1 vs. found old post down N.  $80^{\circ} 45' W.$  230 vs. from an old post for a corner of Survey 923 and 565, placed new corner at old post (down) for the S. E. corner of Survey 164 and N. E. corner of 934.

Thence S.  $9^{\circ} 15' W.$  at 2584.6 vs. intersect the North line of Porcion 86, N.  $80^{\circ} 45' W.$  190.6 vs. from its N. E. corner. Thence with the North line of Porcion 86, N.  $80^{\circ} 45' W.$  at 1069.1 vs. placed the S. W. corner of Survey 934, being S.  $80^{\circ} 45' E.$  40.3 vs. from the N. W. corner of Porcion 86. Thence N.  $9^{\circ} 15' E.$  at 2381.6 vs. placed the N. E. corner of Survey 936 and S. E. corner of Survey 933, at 2584.6 vs. to the post mkd. 164 S. W.

Returning to the S. E. corner of Survey 933 and N. E. corner of Survey 936, I ran N.  $80^{\circ} 45' W.$  at 1718 vs. set the N. W. corner of Survey 936, at 2640.3 vs. intersect the East line of Porcion 83, where set corner.

Thence with the East line of Porcion 83, N.  $9^{\circ} 15' E.$  558.4 vs. to the N. E. corner of said Porcion 83. Thence with the North line of Porcion 83, N.  $80^{\circ} 45' W.$  1177.3 vs. set the S. W. corner of Survey 933 and S. E. corner of Survey 628. Thence N.  $9^{\circ} 15' E.$  at 2589.6 vs. set corner in fence for the N. W. corner of Survey 933 and S. W. corner of Survey 89, being S.  $80^{\circ} 31' E.$  240 vs. from a large stone in fence as described in the report of R. S. Dod, said East line of Survey 628 and West line of Surveys 89 and 933, es\_

established by projecting the East line of R. I. Parks survey of Survey 627, to an intersection of the line between said stone and post mkd. 163 N. W., Thence with fence S. 80° 31' E. 1213.6 vs. to said post mkd. 163 N. W. or, the place of beginning.

Returning to corner in the South line of Survey 933, the N. W. corner of Survey 936.

Running S. 9° 15' W. 426.6 vs. intersect the North line of Porcion 84, set a S. W. corner of Survey 936. Thence with the North line of Porcion 84, N. 80° 45' W. at 922.3 vs. the N. W. corner of Porcion 84 in the East line of Porcion 83. Thence with the East line of Porcion 83, N. 9° 15' E. 426.6 vs. to the corner set at the intersection of the South line of Survey 933 and the East line of Porcion 83. Thence with the South line of Survey 933, S. 80° 45' E. 922.3 vs. to the place of beginning.

Making a vacancy of 69.7 acres, as Survey 933 and 936 did not call for the Porciones. I call the vacancy of 69.7 acres on my map and field notes, Survey 969.

Returning to the intersection of the West line of Survey 936 with the North line of Porcion 84, or, the S. E. corner of said 969, I run S. 80° 45' E. 377.7 vs. to the N. E. corner of Porcion 84. Thence with the East line of Porcion 84, S. 9° 15' W. 523.4 vs. to an intersection of a South line of Survey 936 with the East line of Porcion 84, where set corner. Thence with the South line of Survey 936 S. 80° 45' E. 90.3 vs. set corner as called in P. Lopez survey of Survey 936. Thence with West line of Survey 936 S. 9° 15' W. at 811.6 vs. intersect the North line of Porcion 85, where set corner for a S. W. corner of Survey 936. Thence North line of Porcion 85 N. 80° 45' W. at 90.3 vs. the East line of Porcion 84. Thence with the East line of Porcion 84 N. 9° 15' E. 811.6 vs. to the place of beginning.

Placing a vacancy of 13.0 acres, as Lopes in his survey of Survey 936 did not call for the Porciones. I call the vacancy on my map and field notes, Survey 968.

Returning to the S. W. corner of Survey 934, I run N. 9° 15' E. 81.6 vs. to an iron pipe for the S. E. corner of Survey 936, being S. 9° 15' W. 2300.0 vs. from the S. E. corner of Survey 933

W  
4

and N. E. corner of Survey 936;

Thence N.  $80^{\circ} 45'$  W. at 40.3 vs. set an iron pipe in the East line of Porcion 85, a S. W. corner of Survey 936 for the N. W. corner hereof;

Thence with the East line of Porcion 85, S.  $9^{\circ} 15'$  W. 81.6 vs to an iron pipe, the N. W. corner of Porcion 86 for the S. W. corner hereof;

Thence with the North line of Porcion 86, S.  $80^{\circ} 45'$  E. 40.3 vs. to the place of beginning.

Placing a vacancy of 0.58 acres, as Lopez in his survey of Survey 936 did not call for the porciones. I call the vacancy on my map and field notes, Survey 970.

Accompanying this report is a map showing the North lines of Porciones 82, 83, 84, 85, 86 and 87 and Surveys 933, 934, 936, 968, 969 and 970, and adjoining porciones and surveys, with corrected field notes for surveys 933 and 934 and field notes for surveys 968, 969 and 970.

Respectfully Submitted.

*J. H. May*  
Surveyor of Starr County, Texas.