

GARZA COUNTY  
ROLLED SKETCH NO. 14

Correspondence & Reports by W. D. Twichell & others.

*counter 45234*



RECEIVED

DEC 11 1913

Referred to Map

2805-

Leitchfield Tex  
Dec 20<sup>th</sup> 1913

Mr J I Roberson

Austin Tex

Dear Sir on the 29<sup>th</sup> of Nov

I sent you Sketch and a pencil  
letter of about 12 pages showing  
the Relative Position of Surveys.

on Spring Creek in Garza Co

please let me know what your  
reply is and how you will  
instruct Mr Towchell to put -

these Surveys of 1-2-3 and 4

just north of the Walker Survey

the position that German had  
made the Herghas Surveys -

lets off a Strip of land 304

acres wide and about 1395-

acres long off the North End of Survey

No 1. Jasper says the N.M. & Co. claim

this Survey is well identified on

the ground

counter 15235



Showing a conflict for perches  
of 75 acres of land

I will ask how are  
to construct Survey No 1, 2, 4 and 3  
When you pull the loose from the John  
Walker at the present No 4 calls to  
Begin S No of 2 and No 2  
Calls to Begin at S No of No 1  
Where does No 1 call to Begin

it calls to Begin 450 rods East-  
950 rods of John Walker Between two  
little creeks as shown on Sketch.

These two little creeks <sup>calls</sup> are as much  
dignity (as German call of Spring  
Creek) but we have two natural  
calls (two little creeks) Field notes of  
No 1 & 2 also the North Slope of  
Hill in North line of John Walker  
So we have two to give and they fit  
the calls reasonably well we are ready  
to surrender the Patents of No 2 & 4  
and let them occupy the ground  
counter 45234.



3rd

they was intended to my Jasper Heaps  
Says he intended location  
the Public land Between the  
Walker and Block B9.

German Stone mounds that he calls  
S M cov of No 1 was put in by  
Col Smyth and they all had  
to throw in 350 rods Excess  
to fit Spring Creek But ignore  
the plain marks at S M cov  
John Walker and also the NE cov of  
No 1 Jasper Heaps which is the NW  
cov of John Walker (Why do I say that  
the Stone that German calls S M No 1  
I have Smyth's Sketch before me  
and he places it where German  
does least Keelt and Col Smyth  
forms the S M cov of Walker Survey  
and also the Stone mound called for  
NE cov of No 1. But Col Smyth reports  
the both because it was 275 rods Excess  
But the Col stretches his last run 357 rods  
counter 45237



4<sup>th</sup>

to make it fit Spring  
 When Hays ran out 12 483 in  
 north from the walked Survey he put  
 in a new cut too many and when  
 he ran West from the N E cor of  
 No 3 West - 1908 ran thence S 38° 00'  
 rows to S W cor of No 4 to a large stone  
 mound which is 910.4 ran S 89° 30' E  
 and S 38' true course 2067 rows.  
 which is north 80° 36' 15 2 (rows from  
 the N W cor of John Walker making  
 space 226 rows between the north  
 line of John Walker and South line  
 of No 4 the old stone mound  
 just described a S W cor of No 4  
 now to throw out the hall in Free  
 poles of No 2 for little creek and north  
 slope of hill in north line of John Walker  
 this would leave a space of 226 rows  
 for the Hughes Survey this may be said  
 there is a vacancy north of No 1 and Block B9  
 and also north of No 3 please answer by return mail your very Res

W. J. Hays

Count 4523 E



John Walker and adjacent  
owners in Ganga &  
Crosby Counties for  
re-survey by W. H. Finchell

Famin

Scarf

12731

13048

13974

13983

84

88

98

99

14060

14157

17299

300

309

17638

42

44

46

48

19216

258

F

10713

10624

12154

13707

08

43576

63119

81312

SF

4034

35

6361

11069

1-1887

counter 45239



2732

See Book Logs  
11-29th 1913

RECEIVED

DEC 2 1913

Referred to Map Henry J. Robinson

Alister Log

Saw Sir I have been employed  
 by Mr A. B. Robertson to locate sections  
 Pro H. E. & RRRR Co on Spring  
 creek in Garza Co I set a flag  
 on the all stone str no 8 DOOSE R Co  
 31 rods south of Draw as shown  
 on sketch set up my instrument  
 on stone mound on top of hill  
 10 feet high 100 rods north of Day  
 Spring creek (Mag 10° 30' E  
 true course from S R Co of no 8  
 to S E Co of same S 89° 30' E  
 thence S 89° 30' E 950 rods a point  
 on South Bank of Day Spring creek  
 thence S 0° 30' W 2067 rods a point  
 on all stone mound very ancient  
 and deeply imbedded in glacial  
 Bas West 39° 6' rods thence S 0° 30' W  
 226 rods thence S 89° 30' E 1504 rods  
 a point from which German RR



2

Corner of John Walker  
Brs S 10° 15' E 309 rods  
look for a new stone mound that  
Mr Mitchell and I found in 1905  
which is 4093 rods North 92' E  
from an old stone mound marked  
a new stone T or a stone marked X  
which 7873 rods north of S E corner  
1239 at point 1504. E on 224  
South of old mound for S W cor  
of No 4 thence S 89° 30' E at 450  
point look for stone set by Mitchell  
in 1905 - but was thrown away  
and also the old stone mound  
that was taken for S W cor of  
John Walker had been thrown  
away also the pile of stone at  
S W cor of Walker had been thrown  
away I then went to an old  
stone mound a new stone marked  
V which I believe to be S W cor of  
No 1 D & S R R Co. counter 45241



3

which is 350 South and  
 241 rows East of Set Stone  
 in Spring Creek for S M cor of  
 No 18 Block B9. German pile  
 Stone that Williams for S M cor  
 of No 1 D & SERR is 2240 North  
 and 167 rows East of the N M cor  
 of John Walker as Established by  
 an Excess of 340 rows as what is  
 called for in field notes of No 1, 2 and  
 4 out of Position 340 rows North  
 283 rows West. ~~of the~~ as called for  
 in field notes of the above survey and  
 only 320 rows South of Spring Creek  
 this rock mound marks German  
 cor for S M cor of No 1 is 36 rows North  
 and 236 rows West of the corner that I  
 claim for the N M cor of No 1, D & SERR  
 then S 0° 30' W (mag true 10° 18' E) at 828  
 rows cross a small creek at 950  
 rows center of small creek  
 at 1904 end point



from which the North Slope  
 of Hill Bas East - 1900 rows  
 then I looked for Stone Set by  
 Mrs Swichell in 1905 But was  
 thrown away I then ran ~~N~~  $89^{\circ}30'W$   
 450 rows to a point which 226  
 rows  $S^{\circ}30'W$  and 1504 rows  $S89^{\circ}30'E$   
 from an Old Stone mound  
 which is 2067 rows  $S^{\circ}30'W$  and  
 910.4 rows  $S89^{\circ}30'E$  from the  
 original cov of No 8 B & S E R T Co  
 here we look for Stone mound  
 that Mrs Swichell and I found  
 in 1905 but it was thrown away  
 we found 25 Stones scattered around  
 and a part of Stone marked JW  
 that showed it been Broken up  
 I rebuilt this cov for N W cov of  
 John Walker (See Swichell correct  
 Field notes of No 1 Jasper Hays)



No 5~

also See Original Tree  
notes of survey no 2 from  
the N.W. corner of John Walker  
the North Slope of Hill

to East - 2350 rods see Sketch

I think the proper construction  
of no 4 and no 2 by the old  
stone mound at S.M. no 4

Thence S  $80^{\circ} 4' E$  1521 rods to N.W. Walker

Thence S  $89^{\circ} 30' E$  450 Thence N  $30' E$

1904 to an old stone mound

are stone marks for N.W. corner of  
no 1 this leave a vacancy

of 356 rods wide and 1640 rods  
long But if you hold that

the old stone mound at

S.M. no 4 and S  $89^{\circ} 30' E$  1901

rod (in corner) here there  
would be a vacancy of

130 rods Between N.W. D & S.E.

and no 18 Block B 9

and would leave 226

rods space between the

John Walker and no 2 & 4 counter 45244



6

For the Thomas Hughes Survey  
and as the Commission of  
Gen Land Office has pulled  
No 2 & 4 from their original  
connection from the John Walker  
Survey it would be best for the  
State and all parties concerned  
to construct the South line  
of No 4 & 2 by dotted lines  
as shown on sketch

But Mr Gay says he  
Began at the original S W  
cor of John Walker and that  
he ran North and West  
to the ced cor at the mouth  
of Plum Creek N E No 13 Block  
B9 and that he put in  
Surveys 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 and on  
the 7<sup>th</sup> of Sept 1879 and  
that 50 days later put No 5 -  
I & G. N. R. P. Survey



7<sup>th</sup>

But - don't the surveying  
for No 5 the same day  
he put in 1. 2. 3. 4 7 and 8  
and says there is no vacancy  
between John Walker Survey  
and 2 & 4 and would  
swear to the same in any court  
now I will note Mr Hermann  
Report to the Gen Land office  
in 1902. I have his Report and  
map he says he started at the  
S E cor of 1239 and ran north  
(mag. decl. 10.25'E 7600 some for S W  
cor of John Walker Survey  
and at 275 ran north

of that point he found and  
all stone and but did not  
consider it - if he had look closely  
he would have found some stone  
marked T and one marked X  
as called for in Field Nts of  
John Walker Survey and these  
from a point 7600 some  
north of S E 1239

counter 45246



and that he saw 11683  
rows for N M cor of John Walker  
Survey Thence E 167 rows thence north  
2240 rows and all Stone and  
marks Thence North 400 rows  
Spring Creek (When it is only  
320 rows) his report shows  
was very stuck for just exact  
distance until he came to the east  
row north he found a pile of  
stone 340 rows further north  
than his distance called for in  
field notes from the S E cor of 1239  
he calls this corner the S W cor of  
No 1 which is out of position 340  
rows north and 283 rows West  
and makes a vacancy of 1290  
rows wide for Hugh's Survey  
and makes Spring Creek  
call to Base is lines on  
when he says that N M cor of  
No 4 according his  
construction 1670 rows South



9th

## of Spring Creek

When the ~~Fuel~~ Holes Survey  
150 rods north of Spring  
Creek also his construction  
would place the N.W. cor of  
No 4 598 rods north  
710 rods East - of S.E. cor of  
No 8 If he had been  
a Practical Surveyor he  
would have set up at  
S.E. cor of No 8 and run  
950 rods front and  
\$ 2076 rods by money  
have found the old stone  
marked that I have here  
to for mention for S.W. cor  
No 4 also Germans  
construction places  
the N.E. cor of No 1  
on East-Side of yellow  
counter 75248

Keep with Garza Co. rolled sk. 14



10

House Creek which  
says it is on the Valley  
West of the creek I  
and says it is in the  
# Freed of No 1  
also by places  
the S E cor of No 2 right-  
then Red Branch  
northward into yellow  
creek instead of on the  
North Slope of High  
hill in north line  
of John Walker

It is apparent that  
the creek call ~~can~~ made  
to fit the Fieddy notes  
of any these Surveys  
and Jasper Heaps  
says the Intender  
to cover all the public

counter 75299



11

all the same between  
John Walker Survey  
and Block B 9  
and In constructing  
the location of these  
Survey and when the  
calls lead conflicting  
Results: (that construction)

must be adopted which is  
most consistent with the  
calls in the Field notes -  
let us see who has  
found the most correct  
to harmonize with the  
calls in the Field notes -  
We have found the S.W.  
cor of John Walker  
Survey and being  
to 12' E 40 93 0 and  
find a large stone marked  
corner 45250



12 ball found in the Field  
note of Jasper Hayes  
Survey No, East-450  
was a point from  
which on the North Slope  
of Hill No East-1900  
Thence N 1904 you will  
find an old pile  
of Stone and marked  
Y also we found S E  
No 8 S N No 8 and  
N N W of No 7  
German Mass and Stone  
mound and Spring  
Creek 320 rods to the  
center of same and don't  
fit the call in Free  
note - This is a long letter  
but I wanted bring  
out all the facts -  
as I found them on  
The Ground <sup>you</sup> <sub>see</sub> N R Stone <sup>marked</sup>  
3 counter 45251



W. D. TWICHELL  
AMARILLO, TEXAS

Amarillo, Texas. November  
Eight  
Nineteen-thirteen

Hon. J.T. Robison,  
Austin, Texas.

Dear Sir:-

Complying with your instructions dated Oct, 21st-1913 I herewith submit for your inspection a sketch showing the relative position of all surveys on the ground in this vicinity which have not been previously corrected by a state resurvey. Where the surveys are particularly complicated on Spring Creek I have furnished a detail sketch showing amount of conflict between the various tracts.

If you find the large sketch is correctly constructed from the facts shown, it may be convenient for you to direct me to return corrected field notes for all tracts which have not heretofore been corrected by me as shown by the large plat which I am forwarding with this letter.

Your former instruction on Oct. 21st- 1913, does not include surveys 1-3-4-5, Block 3 K Aycock. Since these surveys were the land which the owner ~~xxx~~ is most anxious to get corrected you will please include them in the instructions for corrected field notes which are to follow the detail information which I am now forwarding.

The John Walker as shown on large plat begins at the original S.W. corner of the John Walker survey at 5 sand stones one marked T, one marked  $\bar{x}$  marks completely weathered stained, The original S.W. corner of John Walker as found in 1905 by J.W. James, A.B. Robertson, M.F. Hancock, W.D. Twichell, Jno. W. Pritchett, Paul Pierson, W.R. Standifer, M. Hancock, Earnest Daves. Set stone in the original pile of stones marked S.W.J.W. (the five original stones have now been carried away).

WDT/SS

Yours respectfully,

*W.D. Twichell*

counter 45852



W. D. TWICHELL  
AMARILLO, TEXAS

Amarillo, Texas

November  
Eight  
Nineteen ~~thirteen~~.  
RECEIVED

2211

NOV 11 1913

Referred to Map

Hon. J.T. Robison

Austin, Texas.

Dear Sir:-

Other matters have delayed me an unreasonable time in sending this report. I will therefore appreciate any prompt attention you will give this matter.

The owners are waiving all the rights which they have contended ~~withxxx~~ are theirs, to get prompt actions in correcting these field notes. The immediate object is to promote a sale which is pending.

WDT/SS

Yours respectfully,

W D Twichell

counter 45253