M. D. Rawls

LICENSED STATE LAND SURVEYOR

a COUNTY SURVEYOR, STERLING COUNTY
PHONE 200
P. O. BOX 533

STERLING CITY, TEXAS

October 4, 1955

Commissioner General Land Office Austin, Texas

Attn: Mr. V. E. Sterzing

RE: S. F. 15774 Sterling County

REPORT OF RESURVEY

Dear Sir:

The captioned survey is located along the North and West sides of Survey No. 35, R. R. Wade, Sterling County. The scrap file is in turn bounded on the North by Section 25, and bounded on the West by Section 34; both Sections 25 and 34 are in Block 12, S. P. RR. Company.

The vacant strip of 50.9 acres was caused by the mis-location of said Survey No. 35, and the following evidence is submitted to support this fact:

Blocks 11 and 12, S. P. RR. Company were surveyed by G. M. Carter and field notes written and dated August 4th, 1858. Block 12 was not a uniform block of surveys as field notes of 35 sections were submitted to the Land Office for approval. Since there was no companion survey for number 35, the field notes of this section were rejected and the other 34 approved. On October 23rd, 1883, C. D. Foote made a survey of the rejected Section 35, for R. R. Wade and patent issued on Foote's field notes.

In my resurvey of parts of Blocks lland 12, I found that a line projected westward through the original corners on the North line of Block 11, would strike over 100 varas North of the original corners in the West part of Block 12, although said Block 12 builds off Block 11, using same variation and courses. It is plainly evident that Surveyor Foote, when making his survey for R. R. Wade, started on the ground from the Southwest and Southeast corners of Section 28, Block 12, as these original corners are well defined and easily located. He evidently projected the South line of

OCT 6 1955

GENERAL LAND OFFICE

counter 37189

0-85

M. D. Rawls

LICENSED STATE LAND SURVEYOR

& COUNTY SURVEYOR, STERLING COUNTY
PHONE 200
P. O. BOX 533

STERLING CITY, TEXAS

S.F. 15774

6 11 6

Report of Resurvey

Page 2

2 10:00

Section 28 eastward 3 miles, and finding no intervening original corners, he placed his Northeast corner of Section 35 and his beginning point 105.2 varas southerly and 39.5 varas easterly from the Northwest corner of Section No. 7, Block 11, as located from the original corners on the West line of said Block 11m and Kellis' patent corner at the Southwest corner of Section 6 and the Northwest corner of Section 7, Block 11. Foote's beginning point is easily identified on the ground from his river crossing calls and bearings.

Surveyor Foote then located the North line of Survey 35 calling to begin at the Northwest corner of Section 7, Block 11, and to end at a stake at the Southwest corner of Section 25, Block 12. His line on the ground is definitely located by four different river crossing calls and is over 100 varas South of the South line of Section 25, Block 12. Foote failed to call for the East line of Section 34, Block 12, and there is no evidence on the ground that he actually ran any other lines of Section 35. He does have a river crossing call on the East line of the Survey, but since it is only 50 varas South of his beginning point, it is assumed that the measurement was made from said point.

Using Foote's North line of Survey No. 35, I have reconstructed the survey at right angles and called distances as patented, and disregarded his call for the Southwest corner of said Section 25. My construction leaves a tract of vacant land between Survey 35 and the South line of Section 25, Block 12, and between Survey 35 and the East line of Section 34, Block 12. My map showing this construction is on file in your office.

In my re-survey of Blocks 11 and 12, I have used course and prorated distance between original corners found on the ground, with one exception. The course and prorated distance between the original mounds at the Northwest corner of Section 25, Block 12, and the Southeast corner of Section 34, said Block 12, would not satisfy the river crossing calls for the West line of Section 25. The Southwest corner of Section 25 is relocated to satisfy the crossing calls, of the original surveyor.

Block 15, H. & T. C. Ry. Company, is junior to Blocks 11 and 12, and since it is an office survey, and calls for adjoining these adjacent senior blocks, it depends entirely upon them for the location of the sections in my re-survey. I have constructed them in this manner and I again refer you to my map filed in connection with this report.

Respectfully submitted,

mark anel

counter 37190

STERLING County SKETCH FILE Filed Oct. 6 1955 By U.E. Hilly purg Report in donnection with SF. 15174 and a
resurvey of parts of
S. P. Ry. Blks. 11 & 12 and
H. & T.C. Ry. Blk. 15
By M. D. Rawls
Oct. 4, 1955
(See Rolled Sk. 25) counter 37/9/