

disregarded the comments of Mr. Ferguson, because he did not observe the corner stone in its original condition nor did he give due consideration to the measurement one mile south to the original corner stone which is of call size, set upright in the ground and marked correctly.

Concerning the position of the township corner at the NE corner of T13S, R30E. I considered these facts before re-establishing the corner position as shown on Survey No. 1601, which I accept in this survey.

I searched the area at the double proportion position and found no evidence of the original corner. After finding several original corner stones that were not recovered during Survey No. 785, I began to question the placement of the township corner shown on Survey No. 785. I contacted Mr. Stout who contacted Mr. Ham. When Mr. Stout, Mr. Ham and myself visited the NE corner of Section 1, T13S, R30E. We found that there is a creek that runs easterly and another creek to the north about 250 feet. There is no mention of the creeks in the GLO notes, not at the corner or when they were crossed running north or east. The area of the double proportion has been badly disturbed by logging around the 1950's. Stumps were shredded from having logs skidded over them and a swath about 80 feet wide was evident where they skidded logs. I believe this accounts for the missing corner stone and its accessories. In the area of the proportion there appeared to be water near the surface. The juniper trees in the immediate vicinity were tall with limbs that were widely spaced. We found the rotted remains of a hardwood stump about 10 inches at the base, near the proportionate position. Although no evidence remains that this was one of the original alder bearing trees, it is evidence that water loving trees did grow near the proportion position about 100 feet south of the creek where it runs today.

During the review of the original notes this fact was revealed concerning Mr. David's survey practice. When a corner fell on a creek or at the foot of a hill or on the river bank he called it. Out of the 280 corners I reviewed, four corners had a reference that the corner was set at a distinct topographic feature.

- 1) At the N1/4 corner of Section 31, T13S, R30E the GLO notes state "Set stone 17x9x8 for 1/4 section corner on creek bottom bears N-S."
- 2) At the NW corner of Section 25, T13S, R31E the GLO notes state "Edge of river bank runs south - Set stone 15x9x5 for corner to sections 23, 24, 25, 26."
- 3) At the NW corner of Section 27, T13S, R31E the GLO notes state "Set stone 14x12x8 for corner to sections 21, 22, 27, 28 at foot of hill bears E-W."
- 4) At the W1/4 corner of Section 22, T13S, R31E the GLO notes state "Set stone 15x10x7 for 1/4 section corner at base of hill."

My conclusion from this review is that Mr. David did not set the NE corner of Section 1, T13S, R30E, at the creek edge as Mr. Ferguson has contended or he would have given a call to the creek, which was his practice in this vicinity.

My conclusions concerning this corner are as follows:

- 1) The corner is lost. There is no evidence of the original corner stone or the original bearing trees.