

D-749

SURVEYOR'S REPORT

The Stuart-Griffin Ranch, located in Zavala County, Texas is situated about 14 miles N.70° W.(Ranch Headquarters) from Crystal City, the county seat of Zavala County. It is comprised of all or part of the following surveys:

	Survey No.	Abstract No.
J.M. Alexander	302	9
J.M. Bustillo	593	66
G.W.T. & P.	597	156
I. & G.N.	300	495
A.C. Ruiz	297½	567
O. de A. Santangilo	306	574
J.F. Torrey	595	605
Amanda Williams	900	734
M. Salinas	593½	810
B.F. Burt	301	819
G.C. & S.F.	9	835
I. & G.N.	1	885
Nancy Meyers	595½	887
G. Schuhart (I. & G.N.)	596	892
S. & S. Pilkington	608	1028
A. Van Cleve (W.½)	10	1212
A. Van Cleve	8	1216
Willie Van Cleve	598 3/4	1274
(Patented but covered by senior surveys in so far as Stuart-Griffin ownership is concerned)		
E.A. Giraud	599½	

and contains 10,740.17 acres.

To reach the ranch from Crystal City, go west on farm-to-market road to the Cometa Settlement, thence NNW on gravel road some six miles to the ranch headquarters.

Before commencing work on the ground, I made a thorough investigation of the records of the General Land Office. I have also had the benefit of complete abstracts furnished by Mrs. Stuart.

While on the ground, I talked to Mr. Caswell Van Cleve, 86 years old, who settled in this area with his father in 1888. His statements that various fences have never been moved was of value, in that some of Geo. Myer's (early surveyor) call distances for these fences are in slight variance with actual distance. I also talked to Mr. Willie Ware, age approximately 65 years, who has lived in the area since childhood.

Records of the General Land Office reveal that Survey 302 is the senior survey in the area, having been surveyed by Robert Hays on February 5, 1848, with Survey 301 and Survey 306 having been surveyed by Hays on February 6, 1848. Survey 297½ was surveyed by J. Kuechler on June 18, 1874, and Survey 300 was surveyed by Kuechler on October 6, 1876. All these surveys have been patented on original field notes and each contains considerable excess acreage.

In 1952, I had occasion to work in the area to the northwest of this ranch and in connection with that work I tied in the SW corner of D.A. Dunham Survey 306¼ and SE corner of Survey 5 which is the NW corner of Survey 306. O.H. Hector in his survey of Survey 7 and Survey 5 made in 1884 found the Hays trees marked in 1848 and marked a new tree, his call being N.34¼ W. 108 vs. Geo. Myers, in 1926 found the Hector tree and also the Hays tree and found that the Hector tree actually bears N.44 3/4° W. 110 vs. (Myer's call) and marked a

RECEIVED

26277

DEC 18 1956

counter 4144

GENERAL LAND OFFICE

new tree which bears S.47°30' E. 44.8 vs. In 1952, I found the Myers tree, and an old mesquite stump (N.42°45' W. 110 vs., actual) and evidence of an old stump of the Hays tree. In this present work, I found the old stump (Hector) intact, but the Myers tree has been bulldozed down for a power-line right-of-way. It was found uprooted at edge of right-of-way.

At the north (or NE) corner of Survey 306, Myers found one of Hays' witness trees and calls for the corner to be a point S.70°W. 5 3/4 vs. from pasture fence corner and 4.3 vs S.70° W. from a sand rock marked "X". I found the sand rock marked "X" (actually a sandstone outcrop and permanent) and also fence corner in same position as Myers. There was no trace of the Hays witness tree. The creek crossings near this corner checked Hays' calls.

Myers found one original bearing tree at the SE corner of Survey 306 but no trace can be found today. Myers passing call to a fence on the south line of Survey 85 agrees with the actual distance from that fence to a fence corner at SE corner of Survey 306. With this support, I have placed the Survey corner at the fence corner, even though actual distance of the east line of Survey 306 is 7.7 vs. excessive of Myer's call. Geo. Myers, at one time or another, surveyed for partition, sales, or Land Office purposes, all the land which I have resurveyed, and I have found some of his calls for distance to be slightly excessive and some slightly under call and could not attempt to "standardize his chain". Likewise, most of his courses were in even degrees or half-degrees. In general, however, his work can be retraced very closely.

At the SE corner of Survey 301, I found an old 3/4" bolt set in ground under fence, from whence an old mesquite stump bears S.30° E. 6vs. (Hays' call). Myers claims to have found original corner here but no mention was made of setting the bolt. However, with a very old fence line and the old stump for support, I believe this is the original SE corner of Survey 301 even though actual distance of the east line is 10 vs. excessive of Myers' call and the south line is 12 vs. short of Myers' call. At the NW corner of Survey 301 (& NE corner of Survey 300) I found an old 1 1/2" I.P. (no evidence of stake and mound called for by Hayes, although Myers claims to have found "original corner" here). This pipe is situated N.19°18' W. 1974.38 vs. from corner of three fences described in a partition survey by Myers as the original corner of Survey 301, Survey 300, & Survey 297 1/2 from whence he found the original bearing tree called for by Hayes. There is no doubt that this fence corner is at the same position as it was when Myers was there although the witness tree has vanished. Myers' distance for the W. line of Survey 301 was 1973 vs. against my distance of 1974.38 vs.

At the SE corner of Survey 297 1/2, I found only a fence corner, but I found an old line tree on the south line. My distance on E. line of Survey 297 1/2 is 1921.49 vs. compared to Myers' 1929.5 vs.

At the SW corner of Survey 297 1/2 and SE corner of Survey 302, I found an old fence corner, no evidence of witness trees. My distance of S. line of Survey 297 1/2 is 1952.94 vs. compared to Myers' call of 1954 vs. (Myers calls for having found original corner). Deed corners (found) described by Myers in his partition of the Ware lands also supports this location of this corner as well as

RECEIVED

DEC 18 1956

GENERAL LAND OFFICE

counter 71-447

the SW corner of Survey 302.

On the west line of Survey 302 I found a very old line tree, which according to Mr. Willie Ware was deeply marked when he was a child and according to his belief is an original mark of Hays' line. He stated that, as a young man, he had seen several of Hays' line trees along this line but this is the only one left today. With this line tree and the original NW corner of Survey 306, I established the west lines of Survey 302 and Survey 306.

I searched for witness trees called for by Hays and Myers at the NE corner of Survey 302, but found nothing. I constructed the east line of Survey 302 parallel to its west line, with the result that Myers' resurvey calls are followed reasonably close. The SW corner of Survey 306 and NW corner of Survey 302 was established by intersecting a fence line, that used to be the property line between Survey 302 and Survey 306, with the relocated west line of Survey 302 and Survey 306 as above mentioned. I searched for the old Hays witness here, which Myers found "standing green" in 1926 but nothing could be identified. My distance for the west line of Survey 306 of 4665.86 vs. compares favorably with Myer's call of 4662 vs.

Myers' distances for the south line of Survey 306 and his combined distances for Survey 302, Survey 300 and Survey 301 (resurveyed by him at different times) are in slight variance. My total distance along this line is 35.76 varas excessive of his call for the south line of Survey 306 and 14.76 varas excessive of his combined calls for the north line of Survey 302, Survey 300 and Survey 301. Not having been able to find any locative objects at the north east corner of Survey 302, I believe my construction is proper, especially as all Surveys have excess and all are under the same ownership (no difference for either landowner or State).

In regard to the property lines on the western part of the Stuart-Griffin ranch, the fence lines were followed and according to Mr. Caswell Van Cleve they are presently in the same position as reflected by Myers' various partition and deed surveys.

The SE corner of Survey 9 is a point on west line of Survey 306 in county road in line with fence (according to Myers, this fence is on the Survey line). From this corner to the NW corner of Survey 306 there is 27.02 vs. excess over combined calls of Survey 9, Survey 8, and Survey 7. As most of Hector's and Myers' calls were found by me to be a little excessive, I have prorated this 27.02 vs. rather than give it all to Survey 9, the junior of the three.

I found four original corners on this side of the ranch, the NW and SW corners of Survey 595, the NE corner of Survey 593 $\frac{1}{2}$ and the SE corner of Survey 599.

With the two original corners of Survey 595 (the senior survey) I constructed it giving it call distance east and west. I found old markings along the NW line of Survey 593 $\frac{1}{2}$ but could not identify its NW corner. This old marked line fits Myers' surveys of Survey 595 $\frac{1}{2}$ and W $\frac{1}{2}$ of Survey 10 with respect to the original SW corner of Survey 595 with the exception of a small amount of excess east and west.

There is almost conclusive evidence in the General Land Office that Survey 608 was an office survey, at least that its SE and NE corners were not located on the ground. Kuechler surveyed Surveys 596-597-598-599 & 600 (as a system) the following year (after Survey 608) and marked witness trees. This system can be relocated

DEC 18 1956

GENERAL LAND OFFICE

counter 41448

from the original SE corner of Survey 599. Myers found in 1909 that by constructing Survey 608 from Survey 595 that the NW line of Survey 608 would not reach Survey 599 and put in the E.A. Giraud Survey 599 $\frac{1}{2}$. Previously in 1886, Myers had resurveyed for patent Survey 597 and Survey 598, evidently building from Survey 595 and giving each call distance north & south. For his east-west position he worked call distance from the junior surveys to the east, which is obvious from his report in 1903 (at which time he found the original SE and NE corners of Survey 599 and reported that his west lines of Survey 597 and Survey 598 did not reach Survey 599 and Survey 600) at which time he put in a strip Survey 598 $\frac{3}{4}$.

The fact that he had not found these original corners of Survey 599 in 1886, caused him to put in the M.A. Jones Survey 598 $\frac{1}{2}$.

I have constructed Survey 596 giving it call distance from Survey 595, both east & west and north & south, which places it in slight conflict with Survey 608 (as passing call for NE corner of Survey 595 in Field Notes of Survey 608 is 94 vs. and call in Survey 596 for this same distance is 38 vs.). This would tend to place excess in Survey 597 (per Kuechler) as it is controlled by passing call to original SE corner of Survey 599, however according to Myers' 1886 survey on which patent was issued, Survey 597 is in conflict with Survey 596. My findings reveal that Survey 597 and Survey 598 as patented are in slight conflict with Surveys 7-8-9 on the east, Survey 596 on the south and Survey 608 on the west. The patented Survey 598 $\frac{3}{4}$ is completely covered by Survey 608 and Survey 597 south of the NE corner of Survey 608. The net result is that all excesses have been covered by patent and no vacancies exist.

In regard to Survey 599 $\frac{1}{2}$, my client (Stuart-Griffin) and their predecessors in title have always owned the easterly portion (under fence) although they have no record title to same. It is difficult to understand why Myers, after having put in Survey 599 $\frac{1}{2}$, himself, in 1909, continued to report this easterly part of Survey 599 $\frac{1}{2}$ as being a part of Survey 608 to the landowners in 1926.

As my client only owns a small fractional part of Survey 597, we do not wish to file corrected field notes on this Survey.

In further explanation of the accompanying plat, the coordinates shown are in feet and are peculiar to this survey only. Survey corners which show only a coordinate and not an object found or set were not visited on the ground.

Respectfully submitted

Survey completed: October 23, 1956.

C. A. Douglas
Licensed State Land Surveyor

File No. 50

ZAVALA County
Sketch File

Filed Dec. 18 1956

J. EARL RUDDER, Com'r.

By V. E. Arjuna

Report of re-survey of
Stuart-Griffin Ranch

By C. A. Douglas

Oct. 23, 1956

See Zavala Co.

Rolled Sk. 28

Survey completed: October 33, 1956.

Respectfully submitted

C. A. Douglas
Licensed State Land Surveyor



corners which show only a coordinate and not an object found or set shown are in feet and are peculiar to this survey only. Survey
In further explanation of the accompanying plat, the coordinates we do not wish to file corrected field notes on this survey.
As my client only owns a small fractional part of survey 507, being a part of survey 608 to the landowners in 1956.

in 1903 continued to report this easterly part of survey 507 as to understand why Myers, after having put in survey 507, himself, fence) although they have no record title to same. It is difficult predecessors in title have always owned the easterly portion (under In regard to survey 507, my client (Stuart-Griffin) and their that all accesses have been covered by patent and no vacancies exist.

Survey 507 and survey 508 did not reach survey 507 and original SE and NE corners of survey 507 and reported that his west is obvious from his report in 1903 (at which time he found the he worked call distance from the junior surveys to the east, which giving each call distance north & south. For his east-west position survey 507 and survey 508, evidently building from survey 507 and survey 509. Previously in 1886, Myers had resurveyed for patent survey 608 would not reach survey 507 and put in the E.A. Girling that by constructing survey 608 from survey 507 that the NW line of from the original SE corner of survey 507. Myers found in 1903

Survey 600) at which time he put in a scrip survey 508. Lines of survey 507 and survey 508 did not reach survey 507 and original SE and NE corners of survey 507 and reported that his west is obvious from his report in 1903 (at which time he found the he worked call distance from the junior surveys to the east, which giving each call distance north & south. For his east-west position survey 507 and survey 508, evidently building from survey 507 and survey 509. Previously in 1886, Myers had resurveyed for patent survey 608 would not reach survey 507 and put in the E.A. Girling that by constructing survey 608 from survey 507 that the NW line of from the original SE corner of survey 507. Myers found in 1903

counter 41450

(Surveyor's Report)