

For Sketch by Geo. M. Williams dated
11-1902 & filed 1-15-1902 See Sk. E. B-2

For Sketch See
Stonewall County Rollo
Sketch No. "13"
4/29/38 J.L.W.

Hon Charles Royan,

Commissioner of the Gen Land Office
Austin Texas

Dear Sir:-

Having investigated on the ground
the old surveys just N & N.E.
of Royner, in Stonewall County
I beg to report true condition as
I find those old surveys on the
ground. The sketch which accom-
panies this report, truly represents
the surveys as on the ground.

The Benjamin Mculloch Survey
is identified on the ground by one
bearing tree, which has been cut
down but a short time the
stump of which still remains. This
was a well known bearing tree and
is known to have been a marked
tree. There is an old Hackberry grove
400 ^{is.} E of this corner, which satis-
fies original calls. There is a planted
stone at this corner set several years
ago. The original N.W. corner of the
Eli Chaudler Survey is well iden-
tified by one bearing, a Mesq. may
dead, marked 4. very plain old
marks, which br. S 40° E 71 ^{is.} and
a small Mesq. fits for other bearing
and is probably sprout from old root

A

(2)

This corner has been recognized by all
Surveyors & the Chandler Sur. is fenced to it.
I find an old live tree on S. line
of the Peter DeLancey Survey, which
I am satisfied is the old Loring
work. This tree is a dead *Mery.* 435
from S.E. corner of the DeLancey Sur. as
put by me. The Eli Chandler W. line
is 3058.8 \pm long instead of 3110 \pm , as
called for in original field notes.
A line run from the dead *Mery.*
Live tree on S. line of the Peter
Survey will fit a stone at the N.E.
corner of the Jesse Gray Survey. This
stone is well set and there is other
indications of marks not plain enough
to tell what it is. This is probably
the original corner or very close to
it. The Eli Chandler Survey will conflict
with the Ben M^c Culloch Survey 529
 \pm . The S.W. cor. of the Benj. M^c Culloch Sur.
is 255 \pm S. of the Creek, and it is 284
 \pm from Creek where W. line of said Sur.
crosses it S. to the S.W. cor. of on N. line
of the Jesse Gray Survey. It is claimed
that there was a few years ago old
marks along the W. line of the
M^c Culloch Survey, but all trees have
been cut down to clear a way for
the fence line. I did not find
any land marks East of

(3)

SW. corner of the Mculloch Survey
to for S. line of the Mculloch Survey or
N. line of the Jesse Gray Survey
I could find no evidence of the original
corners of the Peter Delane Sur. but
placed it as shown on sketch fitting
old line and the original NW corner
of the Eli Chandler Survey. By this
resurvey the N & S. lines of the Delane
were moved 15' s. N. and its west
line 12' e. of where it was placed
some years ago, and in which
position I recognized it in 1900
when I ^{first} corrected surveys 12 & 13 block
D. - H & T. C. R. R. Co.

At point 1010 s. E. of the original
NW corner of the Eli Chandler. I find
stumps in position as shown by field
notes on said sketch. These I am satisfied
are the stumps of the original bearings
for SW corner of the Thomas Constable
league. The corner as obtained from
these stumps, fits reasonably well
as satisfying call of 1000 s. West to
NW corner of the E. Chandler survey
as per the Chandler field notes. The old
marked line for first mile of bend
of the Constable when continued S.
fits this corner.

A²

The Thomas Constable Labor is shown on sketch, fitting point A. for NW corner of the Thomas Constable league. In this position it fits call for river from point F. at NW corner of the said labor. Salt Fork's course down stream is $N 33^{\circ} E$ for a long distance reaching past point west of point C. at NW cor. of 10 \times pasture as now placed. To slide the labor down the river to fit NW cor. of the Constable league as placed by decree of court, would pinch the labor and it would get probably half its distance west to the river. The river runs as shown on sketch. I can't see why the court pulled the N. line of the league so far north in face of all the evidence on the ground of foot steps of W. Love, the original surveyor

(4)

There is nothing in shape of a bearing tree to identify the N.W. corner of the Thomas Constable league. There is a cedar hacked ^{blazed} on N & S. sides as a fore and aft tree on the old line, ^{itself} that has ^{been} erroneously taken for a bearing tree. This tree would put N.W. corner of the said league at about the W. end of the old 10x fence, which was the corner of the 10x pasture fence, before it was moved further North to point C. on map. At point A. on the map there is a very old mark for a distance of about 1 mile or as far as the cedar brakes go. This line is evidently the original W. line of this league and so been recognized by all surveyors who have seen it. On this line there is a wire fence. Point A. on the sketch is 63 S. N. of W. end of the old 10x fence point B. is 38.42 N. of E. end of the old 10x fence. The solid line connecting points A & B. is a line at right angles to the West line of the Constable league as marked & established on the ground. On line A. B. at about 1300 W. E from A. there is some old land marks

A³

on dead cedars. These marks are
 precisely like the marks on the W.
 line and are of same age and
 are evidences of the footprints
 prints of the original surveyor
 These marks are on several trees
 and cover a distance of some
 300 or 400 ft. At point A. there is
 a prominent high land some $\frac{1}{2}$ or
 3 miles distant which bears N33W
 There is no other prominent point that
 a surveyor would likely take for
 a bearing. No one seems to know
 where Haygood Md. is. I don't know
 whether the Mountain mentioned above
 was ever called Haygood Md. or not
 nor could I find out from any one in
 that country. I believe that line A.B. is
 the true N. line of the Constable league
 I show position of old 10x fence in red ink
 It was not a straight line, but a broken one.
 See plat. The N.E. corner of No 2. B.B. & C.
 can not be identified as bearings are
 gone. Its N.W. corner is a well known corner
 now evidenced by a stump, of one of
 its original bearings, which is S 58° E
 232 ft from the corner. I began at N.W.
 corner of No 2. B.B. & C. R.R. Co. Thence S.
 1900 ft Thence West 2164 ft & Thence
 S. 46.6 ft to point B. - 85 ft to E.
 end of old 10x fence. From point - B.
 it is 53 ft E + 1100.6 ft N. to N.E. cor.
 of 10x pasture as now placed on the ground
 The 10x pasture on N. line of the
 Constable league is now claimed is
 1100.6 ft N. of point B. & is
 counter 37271

1119 S. N. of E. end of the old 10x fence
The old 10x fence is the one mentioned
in the decree of court. I ran some
connecting lines shown in red ink on
sketch. It shows the Jordan as
claimed and fenced on the ground
The S.E. corner of the Jordan was evidently
placed so as to fit the Creek. I think
the S.E. corner of the Jordan as fenced
is a short distance too far South
If placed 100 or more feet N.
it would be near a ravine, where
the Cottonwood called for in field notes
probably stood and distance West to
Creek would fit's calls better. I give
meanders of creek from point E. down
to where creek turns sharply to the East
I found that there is local attractions
in this locality. Needle changes
going from A. to B. over 1° 30' and
lines on E. side of the Constable league
run at a different course from those
on the W. side, due to changing of the
needle.

I Geo. M. Williams, State Surveyor
do hereby certify that the above and
foregoing statement is true and correct
Given under my hand, this 11th day
of January 1902 Geo. M. Williams
State Surveyor

Filed in Gen. Ld.
Office Jan 15th 1902
Wisi

Sketch File No.

"16"

Stonewall County

Statement By Geo. M.

Williams ^{NE} Part of Co.

Filed Jan. 15, 1902 1902

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

4/29/38 Woodland
File Clerk

Descriptive: Statement Filed
with Rolled Sk. No. 13 in
the N. ^E Part of County

See Rolled Sketch No. 13
for sketch filed with this
Statement 4/29/38 J.W.

counter 137273

A⁶