



1875
 1876
 1877
 1878
 1879
 1880
 1881
 1882
 1883
 1884
 1885
 1886
 1887
 1888
 1889
 1890
 1891
 1892
 1893
 1894
 1895
 1896
 1897
 1898
 1899
 1900

Variation $8^{\circ} 30'$ East

Scale 1600 ft = 1 inch

The red lines are the lines in question.

A

202000

Continued in map with title page

1000000
1000000

Victoria Co
~~VI~~
Sketch File VI.
Filed April 27th 1896



1000000
1000000
1000000

counter 39526

A

Victoria, To. April 10th 1896

Andrew J. Baker, Esq.

Commissioner General Land Office

Victoria, To.

Dear Sir

In regard to the correction of the Foster Lewis survey and the Hannibal Boney survey I would ask for instruction in regard to making the same. It appears from the records, that said 2 surveys and the J. B. Porter survey have been made at the same time by E. A. Hensold, and that said surveyor has marked the North corners of said Porter survey, but not those of the 2 other surveys by bearing trees, which can be identified yet, although by true chaining these corners of the other two would have been near trees. I find further, that taking the corners of the J. B. Porter and running from them $N 14^{\circ} E$ ^{685.00} we reach what heretofore has been considered the backline of the Boney and Lewis surveys, having a field fence & a schoolhouse on it. 685.00 is the difference between the Porter upper & the Boney lower line. Unfortunately said surveyor commenced his field notes of said 3 surveys from above, and running the upper line of the Lewis $N 14^{\circ} E 3470.00$ we don't reach said other line by 425 varas, the same is true of the Boney, the upper line of which would go 50 varas further out than the Lewis. The Porter lower line run out from the river is the only line which comes to its marked corner all right, and I presume this was the only line run out by Hensold, his meanders in their inaccuracy speak for themselves, and if used the same to establish the lengths of the other lines of said 3 surveys, the result is what we find a blunder all the way through, for his meanders are not the meanders of To day. Now, sir, more than one half of these surveys, have been until recently under water caused by a raft in the San Antonio River, which has made any work over them almost impossible, they are dry

now, the raft having gone above, being now at the Tally survey, the old riverbed is almost dry, its waters breaking over the banks mostly in Refugio County. This will explain and to some degree account for Hensolds work at the river. Then we have his fieldnotes one way contradicting his work and still his work is in my opinion what ought to guide us, I believe we have to follow the "protocols of the surveyor", still his fieldnotes are in favor of the State, can we set them aside? The result of a survey in accordance with the established line, would be: Hannibal Boney 640 acres Foster Lewers 1279 acres, losing in conflict with the Traverses 62 acres to the inside line, that is 3470.00 from the river, 88 acres between the 2 lines, or 150 acres in all, and a survey of $10\frac{3}{4}$ acres between the H. Boney line and the outside ^{established} line as shown by plat. The result the other way would be Foster Lewers 1217 acres, H. Boney 599 $\frac{3}{4}$ acres and 10 acres State land, the surrounding surveys having been patented. Nobody ever doubted the established back line, it has been held so by W. H. Allen my predecessor and by myself in establishing the lines of The M. E. Kay, the Bryan Scott & The N. Miller surveys, every fieldnote calling for it. Here another matter has to be considered, the original surveyor placed the Lewers in conflict with the Traverses league, we cannot verify said mistake perhaps, but although the corrected fieldnotes would have to exclude said conflict, we might here to take from the same out 1280 acres and then deduct said conflict, as it then exists, or run to the established backline and then exclude it. Now, Sir, as I have on file an application for purchase said State land, also for the correction of the Lewers and Boney, an understanding ^{into} or a ruling from you would save a great deal of work for me and your officers. The first question is, have we to go by the surveyor ^{fieldnotes which we have to correct according} or his work as it appears on the ground, the second must we save a man from a conflict of his own choosing, although circumstances permit us to do so or not?

I have no opinion of my own in this matter
except such as is right and so held by You.

Expecting to hear from You soon, I have the
Honor to remain.

Your obedient servant
M. Stuart
County surveyor of Victoria County.

Victoria Co.
Sketch file II