

Retracement and Resurvey of Subdivisional Lines, T. 26 S., R. 2 W.

CHAINS

- 27.40 North Umpqua trail, bears NE and SW; ascend over rocky bluffs.
- 30.20 Sharp rocky ridge "The Hogback" bears NE and SW; descend NW slope
- 39.26 Set an iron post, 3 ft. long, 1 in. diam., 26 ins. in the ground, for $\frac{1}{4}$ cor. of sec. 16 only, with brass cap marked

$\frac{1}{4}$ S16
1918

from which

A cedar, 18 ins. diam., bears N.75*E., 26 lks. dist.

Marked $\frac{1}{4}$ S 16 B T

A fir, 40 ins. diam., bears N.5*W., 42 lks. dist.

Marked $\frac{1}{4}$ S 16 B T

An old $\frac{1}{4}$ cor. bears N.42*40*W., 4.52 chs. dist; this cor. is the one referred to by Irving P. Gardner and Clay C. Grant in their statements in regard to this line, and appears to have been set as the $\frac{1}{4}$ cor. of secs. 16 and 21. I find an old post, about 2 ins. diam., considerably decayed, but with scribe marks still plain. These marks appear similar in their characteristics to those made in the McQuinn survey. I find one old bearing tree, down apparently for many years; the letters B T are scribed in the bark near the root. I find no indication of an upper blaze or the marks which would probably have been made thereon, yet it is possible that such marks may have been scribed in the bark and scaled off during the years since the tree fell. I do not find that this cor. corresponds with McQuinn's notes in any particular, except that this tree does not vary greatly from the described position. McQuinn described a hemlock, 12 ins. diam., bearing S.5*W., 10 lks. dist.; this tree is a red fir, 20 ins. diam., bears S.20*W., 13 lks. dist. as near as I could locate its original position. My observation of McQuinn's corners in this Tp. shows that he invariably calls a white fir a "hemlock" and a red fir a "fir". I make diligent search for a bearing tree for sec. 16, but find none and find no indication that a tree has ever existed in a position approximately near that which the notes describe; I, therefore, am positive that this is not the cor. described in the field notes though it may have been set at or about the time of the McQuinn survey.

Furthermore, in 1916 I found a corresponding corner south of the river, which I consider is undoubtedly the corner described in the McQuinn field notes. Both post and bearing tree being badly decayed and in danger of obliteration by fire or otherwise, I consider it necessary to establish some new mark for the preservation of its position; therefore, without disturbing any of the old marks and considering the old cor. as a reference point, I take a new witness thereto, as follows: From the old post.