

E. T. R. R. Surveys, Block No. 1. 113 BB New Cor. East 2025 89°12 A 1104 Od str. md. Feliciano Valdez Survey 5/n. m4.4% 719.3 A East 1589 East of line N.83°40'E. Total / 878.9 A. New Cor. Tory Received and filed in General Land affice on april 23rd, 1936. At Walker, Com C.F. Blucher E.T. R.R. and T. & P. R. R. Surveys platted in accordance with their original corners as found on the ground. Scale. Varas: G. H. & H. R. R. Surveys platted from surveys made under the instructions of the General Land Office of Texas, 1936, I. Proctor R. Clothe, County, Surveyor of Shackellord County, Texas, B. and Theensed State Lond Surveyor of Texas, hereby certily that the above 64 Miles T. & P. R. R. Surveys located by Irvin and Champlin, 1874. Licensed State Surveyor. G. H. & H. R. R. Surveys located by Geo. A. Kirkland, 1874. Field work completed The ator the Selacher, County Surveyor, Shackel ford County, Texas, Maros 14, 1936.

Sketch File No. 8County Shackelford "oversize"

PROCTOR K. CLARKE, CIVIL ENGINEER GENERAL PRACTICE OF ENGINEERING LICENSED STATE SURVEYOR

elizza

RECEIVED

APR 2 3 1936

ALBANY. TEXAS April 15, 1936.

Mr. W. P. Newell, Albany, Texas.

Dear Mr. Newell;

I have to-day re-examined the Field Notes recently prepared by me for Sections Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 1 (7), G. H. & H. R. R. as surveyed according to the instructions given Jan. 28, 1936, by the officials of the General Land Office to survey those Sections in such manner as to place all the longitudinal excess existing between the Southwest corner of Sec. No. 31 and the Southwest corner of Sec. No. 168, Block No. 1, E. T. R. R., within the boundaries of Sections Nos. 2, 4 and 6.

Annahoren.

.

Have tried, as far as possible, to meet the requirements set out in Mr. Blucher's letter of the 11th inst. addressed to you.

As the length of the North line of Sec. No. 4 has a different value in the new Field Notes to the value stated in the original Field Notes Mr. Blucher requires that the words "new count" be inserted in the description of that line: this has been done.

In the same way the length of the South line of Sec. No. 5 differs from the length stated in the original Field Notes, the said line being given a value of 1879.6 vrs. in the new Field Notes whereas the length as stated in the original Field Notes is 1880 vrs. Mr. Blucher requires that the words "new count" be inserted in the description of that line: this has been done.

The two westermost Sections of this Block are numbered 7 and 8 on the record in this office but the old Field Notes on file in the Gen. Land Office number these same Sections 1 and 2.

In the attempt to avoid these Sections being confused with Sections Nos. 1 and 2 at the Eastern end of the Block I numbered them 7 (1) and 842 8 (2) but Mr. Blucher suggests that the numbers on the Land Office records be given the preference, so the numbering on these two Sections has been changed to 1 (7) and 2 (8).

There was a typographical error in the Field Notes for Sec. No. 1 (7), in which the Southeast cor. of Sec. No. 143 was mentioned when the call should have been for the Southwest cor. of that Section: this error has been corrected.

Also there was an error made in copying figures in the language describing the North line of Sec. No. 5, there was an erroneous distance stated: 533 vrs., when the figures on the plat and balance sheet indicate that 523 vrs. is the correct distance. This error has been corrected. PROCTOR K. CLARKE, CIVIL ENGINEER GENERAL PRACTICE OF ENGINEERING LICENSED STATE SURVEYOR

a

ALBANY, TEXAS

Mr. W. P. Newell, page two.

The new Field Notes for Sec. No. 4, G. H. & H. R. R. as surveyed according to the instructions of the Gen. Land Office stated the area of that Section as being 776.85 acres: it seems that some one in the Land Office checked the area and arrived at a result of 777 acres.

The Land Office computer is in error 0.15 acre.

The area of this Sec. No. 4 was recalculated and as shown by the inclosed balance sheet the correct area is 776.85 acres. However the error is so small that the Land Office value of 777 acres is left on the Field Notes without correction.

It is hardly possible to meet Mr. Blucher's requirement that it be stated that the individual Sections were surveyed on certain days.

Some of the Southern boundary lines of the E. T. R. R. Block were surveyed as early as 1924 and some of the Northern boundary lines of the T. & P. R. R. Blocks were surveyed at an earlier date than 1924, these lines being also the boundaries of the G. H. & H. R. R. Surveys.

Last year you employed me to survey your Sections Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6 and 1 (7), and the method followed was to first survey the entire boundary of the group, locating such original corners as could be found and identified be fore any of the lines between the G. H. & H. Surveys were ran out.

The record shows that this work was completed on the 6th day of August, 1935 and the Field Notes for all Sections were dated "Completed Aug. 6th, 1935."

In the same way the re-survey, made under the **Instructions** of Messers Hawkins and Blucher was made, considering the whole area of the seven Sections as a group.

These instructions necessitated the shifting to the Westward, to a greater or less extent, all G. H. & H. R. R. corners except the two Eastern corners of Sec. No. 1 and the three Western corners of Sec. No. 1 (7).

All the new G. H. & H. corners were built and witnessed that fell on the South boundary line of the E. T. R. R. before the corners falling on the North boundary line of the T. & P. R. R. Were established. You can readily see that no particular Section was surveyed on any particular day in any particular year, but the work was all complete by a certain date, which date is so stated in the certificate at the bottom of the Field Notes.

Under the circumstances, I feel sure that Mr.Blucher will waive any insistance that the dates be changed, especially in view of the fact that on the new Patents to be issued neither the name of the surveyor nor the date of survey will appear.

Sincerely yours, Rotta M. Clarke