

To A J Gibson Esq District
Young Land District
Graham Texas

Dear Sir

Having filled bond and qualified
as Special Deputy Surveyor for Stonewall County,
at the request of Mr J E Bonpart acting
as agent for ^{J W.} ~~Mr~~ Snyder I proceeded
with him to said County to examine a
conflict, which he {Mr Bonpart} alleged that
he had found during last year the conflict
it was stated involved the interests of
the ~~land~~ ^{land} as a considerable portion
of a large tract of land bought by Mr
Snyder from

was in conflict with older surveys, to wit,
Surveys nos 7, 11, 10 & 12 Adams Beatty & Boulton
Surveys Block B were said to be seriously
in conflict with surveys nos 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7
Block A, Arnold & Barrett surveys.

And Brooks & Burleson surveys nos 1 & 2
Rush Transportation Co surveys nos 1 & 2
& Seal & Morris surveys nos 1, 2 and part
of 3 were said to be entirely lost
in conflict with Block A, Arnold
& Barrett and the Buffalo Bayou
Brooks & Colorado Rail Road Co surveys
south of the A & B surveys.

counter 37196

Searching for a corner of the F H K Day Survey north of No 127 B B B & C Surveys. I found an old witness plainly marked standing at the S W corner of the Nathan Mitchell Survey, which is also the westerly N W corner of the F H K Day Survey. From said corner I run East 860 m and 800^m North but did not find the corner of the Day. Thence East at 1674 m I found the South East corner of the Milford Norton Survey on the north line of the Day which I identified by both old witnesses standing in corresponding positions and plainly marked but 110 m north of my line. This fixes the position of the S W corner of the Mitchell Survey in section 1 Arnold & Barrett Surveys (as located) 298 m North and 1033 m West from the S E corner of said No 1 which is also the N E corner of No 127 B B B & C Surveys. I failed to find any corners on the Jos H Sanford Survey but giving its position from the N E corner of No 35 B B B & C Surveys its S E corner would fall 803 m East and 314 m South from the N W corner of Survey No 1 Arnold & Barrett or would conflict with said No 1, 314 m x 803 m and conflict with No 2 Arnold & Barrett (as located) 314 m x 1022 m

R2

counter 37198

counter 37200

4

Proceeding to a point that Mr Kompart had identified as the S E corner of Survey No 32 B.P.B. & Co RR land surveys I found both old witness trees (cedars) in corresponding positions as shown by original field notes. To satisfy myself further I made the following runs with the results noted below. I run north from this old corner at 792 vs I found an old Mesquite witness tree west 35 vs which I accepted as the SW corner of No 30 B.P.B. & Co surveys, and continued north 950 vs but found no corner. Thence East at 488 vs I found an old witness tree plainly marked which I accepted as the SW corner of Survey No 29. 5030

I then returned to the SW corner of No 30 and run east, at 570 vs found an old Mesquite side line tree south of line, at 2360 vs bend of river. at 2780 vs an old side line tree a Cottonwood south of line at 3857 vs bank of river one old witness a Cottonwood standing plainly well. From this corner I run north 960 vs to the north line of Survey No 29. Thence ~~west~~ ^{east} to the river found an old witness a Cottonwood on the East side of river plainly marked which convinced me that the Beginning point was the original S E corner of Survey No 32

R3

6

Survey, the North line of said Fowler Survey being 760 varas South from the North line of Survey No 3 Block A in the name of Arnold & Bennett, No 7 A B & 16 Surveys Conflicts with said No 3 1230 varas and there is a corresponding Conflict or a Conflict of 1230 varas in Surveys Nos 10, 11 & 12 A B & 16 Surveys ... with Arnold & Bennett Surveys Block A

No 12 also Conflicts with Block D Houston & Texas Central R.R. Co's Surveys as recently established by J. L. Chalk in a resurvey of said Block. four different Corners were found on his line of Block D and distance Carefully measured from said line to the N.E. corner of No 12 which proved to be 1315 varas or a Conflict of 585 varas with Block D, but connecting two of Mr Chalk's Corners I found that the variation used in running said line was 9° 33' E as shown by my instrument against 9° 40' used in the old Surveys on the river or a difference of 7 minutes or in other words the lines of Nos 12 - 13 - 15 - 16 & 17 as based on the older ^{surveys} - running with a variation of 9° 40' E approach the line of Block D at the rate of 4 varas per mile The Conflict with

R5

Block D of surveys 13-15-16 + 17 A B + M
 surveys will equal the conflict of 12 at
 the north line, to wit, 585 varas plus 4
 varas for each mile run north

Brooks + Burleson Survey No 1, you
 will find by reference to its field notes
 has its beginning on the west line of
 Survey No 36 in the name of Henry Fowler
 470 ns south from the N W corner of said
 No 36 which is also the position of the
 S E corner of No 7 A B + M surveys Block
 B. Then, the south line of Nos 7-10-11 + 12
 of said surveys is the north line of Brooks
 + Burleson and Rusk Transportation Co's
 surveys, and Seale + Morris surveys
 continue west on the same line. Said
 Nos 7-10-11 + 12 being 1230 ns in conflict
 with Arnold and Barrett surveys and
 the south line of said Block being the
 north line of B + B. R J Co + S + M surveys
 it follows that they conflict with
 A + B surveys the 1230 ns plus their own
 width = 1659 ns or the south line of said
 survey is 989 ns south of the north line
 of the B B Co's R R Co's surveys showing
 a conflict with the A + B surveys of 670 ns
 and with the B B Co's surveys of 989 ns
 = 1659 ns or in other words all of these
 surveys are absorbed by conflict with
 counter 37202

with the A + B and B B B + C Surveys.

{The whole Conflict being with A + B Surveys
of course, after passing west of the N W
Corner of No 165 B B B + C } until the west
line of said A + B Block is reached four
miles further west, Survey No 3 Seal &
Morris Survey then extends 1593 m west
from the N W corner of said A + B Block
or 583 m x 1659 m of said No 3 is lost in
Conflict with said Block and 1593 m
of its length and the entire length
of No 4 = 2176 m in all 3769 m will be
entitled to a position on the map due
west of Nos 10 & 11 A + B Surveys the N E
Corner of No 3 as corrected being on the
West line of No 10 A + B Surveys 1230 m South
from N W corner of said No 10.

Running The Arnold and Bonett
Surveys South at 531 m West and 124
m South 15 E from the S E Corner of
Survey No 23 I found the original S E
Corner of the Wm Bardeman Survey
which I identified from old field notes
showing a conflict on the South line of
No 23 of 1369 m with the Bardeman also
Conflicts on Surveys Nos 19 - 20 - 24 + 26 of
A + B Surveys with the Bardeman &
The Austin & Williams Surveys.

B7

The extent of which is shown by
sketches and field notes accompanying

I, Martin Swall, Special Agent, District
Surveyor for Storewall County do
certify that the above described
examination was made on the ground
and old marks found as stated
therein and that connections of
different surveys are truly described
therein as ascertained from old marks,
and courses and distance given in
field notes of surveys that had no
established corners, and that this
report is recorded in a book kept by
me for the record of official work in
Storewall County on from page 65 to
66 inclusive

Martin Swall

District Surveyor
Storewall County

The State of ^{Wis} ~~Wis~~ ^{Wis}
County of Young, The above and foregoing
report recorded in my office in Graham, in
Book N. on pages 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9.
This June 1 1886.

A. J. Gibson
Surveyor Young Land Dist.

Sketch File No. C

Stone wall County

Report By Martin

Dewell in S.E. part of Co.

Filed June 4, 1886

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

4/29/38 Woodland

File Clerk

Descriptive: Report Filed

with Rolled Sk. "A&B" the

SE. part of the County

4/29/38 - J.W.

June 4/86

counter 37205

P9