

Hon Charles Royan.  
Commissioner of the General Land Office  
Austin Texas.

Dear Sir:-

Having made investigations on the ground to identify the Daniel Martindale Surveys 1, 2 & 3. the W. F. Maury and Menard's Cordova Leayne & Labor & other surveys in N.E. corner of Stone wall Co. & S.E. corner of King County; beg to report results of those investigations -

I found on the ground an old stone mound from which a solid rock mdd + br. N $42^{\circ}$  W marked for sketch at point A. 6 vs. This stone mdd is 8435.6 vs. 81 $^{\circ}30'$  W

and 7115.7 vs. 808 $^{\circ}30'$  is of the old stone monument at the N.E. corner of Sur. no 1

Block D - H & T.C. Ry Co. - Drinkins. the surveyor who located block D. made the monument at the N.E. cor. of Block D. and for connecting line he calls to be West 73 vs. & North 84 vs. from a stone mdd at S.E. corner of No 1 D.

Martindale from which a stone mdd + br. N $45^{\circ}$  W 6 vs. There can be no question raised as to the old stone mdd. above referred to not being the point from which Drinkins ran his connecting line to locate N.E. cor. of No. 1 Block D. Drinkins variation was less than the true variation and I find his lines to be N $130^{\circ}$  E instead of N & S $88^{\circ}30'$  E instead of E. as compared with solar courses, hence I have mapped

Surveys 172 H T & B Ry Co. and other surveys  
connecting with nos 172. at an angle  
of  $1^{\circ}30'$ . placing SW corner of No 1. at the  
intersection of E line of Sur 5 Block D  
with line brought from the old corner  
at S.W. corner of Sur 1 D. Martindale  
As Dink is surveyed No 1. H.T. & B. I think  
it is best to map these surveys on the  
course we find Dink's lines to run  
elsewhere, especially as he intended  
that they should parallel and right  
angle Block D. which would place S.W. cor.  
of No 1. 1064.4 S.  $N130'E$  of S.E. corner of  
Sur. 5 Block D. as mapped by me  
I ran a connecting line west from  
S.W. cor. of the Phillip H. Cannons Sur.  
and made several stone mounds along  
the connecting line, intersecting E line  
of Sur 5 Block D 770 S.  $N130'E$  of S.E. cor. of  
said Sur. as shown in Red ink on  
sketch. Some of the stone mounds, thus made,  
are put down on my sketch, as bearings  
to S.W. & E. corners of No 1 and S.E. corner  
of No 2 H T & B. R.R. Co. From the old stone rd.  
at pt. A. on map at which I mapped S.W. cor.  
No 1 D. Martindale I ran  $S85^{\circ}10'W$  (solar  
line at 11.76 S. on old stone rd in all 1285 S.  
Made a stone Md. for S.W. cor. P H. Cannons  
Sur. Thence  $N4^{\circ}50'W$  2688 S. Made a stone  
Md. whence <sup>an</sup> old stone Md. Ls.  $S66^{\circ}21'E$  214.6 S.  
From said old stone Md. at A. I ran  
Thence  $N85^{\circ}10'E$

1344 S. and set a large stone for S.E. cor. No 1 D. Martin-  
dale whence a Mesy. 6 lbs N 3 $\frac{1}{4}$  E 19 $\frac{1}{2}$  S. a do 4 lbs  
N 33 W 17.7 S. The Martindale Surveys. the P.H.  
Commiss & W.F. Maury Surveys are were  
made at Magnetic Courses no variation  
being used, hence lines that call to be  
 $N 15^{\circ} W$  I find to be  $N 4^{\circ} 50' W$  & lines  $S 75^{\circ} W$   
are  $S 85^{\circ} 10' W$ . And connecting line calling  
 $N 80^{\circ} W$  is  $N 69^{\circ} 50' W$ . as shown on sketch  
There is an error in the original field notes  
of Survey No 1 D Martindale. that has  
caused most all the confusion of boundaries  
in this locality; the stone md & solid rock  
marked is at SW corner & not at SE corner  
This fact taken in connection with the fact  
that some of the surveys are at a Magnetic  
courses & not true courses, furnishes the key  
to the boundary troubles in this locality  
I ran from S.E. corner of No 1 Martindale  
 $S 69^{\circ} 50' E$  2000 ft, and landed on sand  
bar at forks of Salt & Double Mountain  
forks of the Brazos River. The River here  
as elsewhere, has encroached in the banks  
and has widened greatly. Old settlers  
living in that vicinity, say that the river  
15 or 20 years ago had not washed away  
any of the land west of the small island  
shown in sketch and J.C. Jones, says a  
way in road ran along Valley E of the small  
island in 1886. The Martindale Surveys 182  
and the M & P & P R.R. Co. 640 acres ~~said~~

over a level Mesquite flat except  
a fringe of roughs along West line  
where the broken country sets in.

It is evident that these surveys were  
located to cover this flat. If we let  
placed 1344 S. further  $88^{\circ} 10' W$  it will put  
No 172 in the Mountains and the connection  
with No 3 will not fit as per original  
calls. From S.E. corner of No 1 Martindale as  
located by me, a stone md. said to have  
been made by Wm Standifer. Many years  
ago ls.  $N 4^{\circ} 00' W$  24 S. &  $N 85^{\circ} 10' E$  117 S.  
This stone md is the corner from which all  
& work has been done of recent years  
by Surveyors in locating the preemptions  
along the river. At S.E. corner of No 1, there  
is a smooth Mesquite flat with no  
stones either loose or solid for probably  
half a mile to the E & S & N & West  
I have shown on sketch in red ink. connecting  
line from S.E. corner of No 1 D. Martindale  
to No 3 D. Martindale also to S.W. cor. Danl.  
Kitchens & corners of the D. Maurey <sup>L.R.</sup> London  
& R. Brittain Surveyors as identified on  
ground. The three Martindale surveys, were  
according to the field notes made by M.D.  
Bullion in 1869. The N.F. Maurey and  
Danl. Kitchens <sup>were</sup> made by J.N. Hawkins  
1872. The dates of the actual surveys of  
the Maurey and Kitchens are not given  
only the date of record by district  
Surveyor Boone is given

hence it is very probable that Hawkins  
did not do this work, but that it was  
done by Bullion in 1869. I am of the  
opinion that all of this work was done  
by the same man, for it is hardly probable  
that both of these surveyors were ignorant  
of the fact that there is such a thing as a  
variation of the needle. The S.W. corner of the David  
Kitchens is well identified on its ground being an  
old stone md. with 2 marked stones as bearings  
I have hesitated some as how I should map  
this survey from its original, whether to  
make its lines E & West &c. or at an angle  
like the Martinsdale Survey but decided  
to map it on an angle, in as much as the  
W. F. Mauney is at a magnetic course  
and for the reason that the courses to the  
bearing stones to the S.W. corner would show  
that no variation was used. I have mapped  
the W. M. Smith Sur. from S.W. cor. of Kitchens  
Sur. 1287<sup>100</sup> N 84<sup>1/2</sup> W of said cor. for N.W. cor.  
of said Smith Sur. There is an old stone md.  
at S.W. cor. of W. F. Mauney from which old stone  
md. by N 79<sup>1/2</sup> W 50<sup>00</sup>. There is also an old  
stone md. at S.E. corner of said Mauney  
Sur. and one at N.W. corner of that Sur. about  
100 ft. N of a branch. I did not have full  
field notes of the Mauney Sur. & might have  
identified the N.W. cor. as original also.  
There is a stone md. on solid rock md + very  
(old) at N.E. cor of No 3 Martinsdale which

which satisfies the description of that corner in original field notes. There is an old stone md. on solid (shaly) sand rock at NW. cor. of Martindale No 3. This solid rock could not show the original mark as it is continually scaling off at surface and marks would be obliterated.

This stone Md is evidently the stone Md from which the M. Cordova Leagues & Labor was surveyed also from which Survey No. 1 G.H. & H. R.R. Co. was surveyed

The cordova Survey was evidently an office location, I place SW. corner of the cordova Sm. at intersection of line carried  $118^{\circ} 30' W$  from N.W. cor. of Dan L. Martindale No 3 and a line brought  $S\frac{1}{2}^{\circ} W$  from old stone at original S.E. cor. of Sur. no 1 G.H. & H. R.R. Co. (see sketch). The S.E. corner of No 1 G.H. & H. R.R. Co. is a stone Md. (old) near the foot of a Mountain. the Mountain being about 2500'. N & W. from this old stone Md. Kiowa Peak is not visible but at point 2400'.  $N\frac{1}{2}^{\circ} E$  on top of the mtn. it looms up to view. I think there is no doubt that this is the original corner. I did not find any evidence of N.E. cor. No 1 or N.E. & N.W. corners of No 2. G.H. & H. R.R. Co. but as all these corners are in red Gy p. brases its is a rare thing to find old corners in these brases as the surface is continually being changed by washes.

The B.B. & C. R.R. Co. Survey's tie on to the  
G.H. & H.R.R. Co. Survey's. I place N.E. corner  
of No 2 B.B.B & C. R.R. 3800 s.  $N\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$  E of  
N.E. cor. of Sur. 2 & 4600 s.  $N\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$  E of the old  
Stone Md. at S.E. cor. of Sur. 1 G.H. & H.R.R.  
at point B. conflicting with Survey's 253  
254 & 261 Block F. - H.T.C. R.R. Co. its back point  
being 600 s.  $N\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$  E & 346 ± 888 30' E of S.E. cor. of Sur.  
254 & SW. cor. 261 block F. - H.T.C. R.R. Co. - see  
sketch. I Geo. M. Williams State  
Surveyor. do hereby certify that the  
above and foregoing statement is true  
and correct.

Given under my hand in  
City of San Antonio this 22<sup>nd</sup> day  
of Sept. A.D. 1902.

G.M.W.

Geo. M. Williams  
State Surveyor

Geo. M. Williams

R-71

counter 37282 R-71

Sherman County 18.

Report of State Surveyor  
G.M. Williams, with Blueprint  
Sketch Certified to by him, also  
original sketch in Roll file  
as part of this.

Filed Nov. 1902.

Stonewall Co  
St. File 18

\$3.00

counter 37283

R-88