



M 96-61 A & B, M 96-62, M 96-63 A & B,
M 96-64 A & B, M 96-65 A & B

IN REPLY REFER TO

United States Department of the Interior 9641 (942)

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

OREGON STATE OFFICE
P.O. Box 2965 (825 N.E. Multnomah Street)
Portland, Oregon 97208

January 26 **FILED**

RECEIVED *RP*

MAY 16 1984

COUNTY SURVEYOR
DOUGLAS COUNTY, ORE.

Mr. James W. Prochnau
Jackson and Prochnau, Inc.
P. O. Box 177
Albany, Oregon 97321

Dear Mr. Prochnau:

This is in response to your request for our opinion concerning survey procedure in T. 21 S., R. 11 W., Willamette Meridian, Oregon, as discussed in your meeting with Dan Berry on January 24, 1984.

As you point out in your letter accompanying the material presented in the meeting, this situation was previously addressed in a letter from this office to the Douglas County Surveyor, dated January 25, 1974. The procedures for reestablishing lost corners outlined in that letter were those which would normally be used when considering the methods originally used to establish the section corners involved.

Based on the ground conditions you have developed, your submitted material contains several proposed methods, including the 1974 BLM recommendation, all of which indicate some distortion in bearings and/or distances from the original record. The 1974 BLM recommendation (your method No. 1) creates what we consider to be minor distortion in bearing but produces distances that in most cases are closer to matching the record than the alternatives; i.e., some bearing distortion gives way to generally good distance relationships.

After examining all possible methods that you have proposed, it appears that no one method can be adopted that will not create some distortion. Considering this, we feel the factor that should determine the method used is that which would normally be called for in such instances, according to the BLM Manual and common practice. Therefore, it is our opinion that the procedures outlined to Mr. Ingram in 1974, and reiterated in your letter, are still valid and would probably be used by this office if we were conducting the survey.

Def 4

C.S. File No. 58/294-1A

With regard to the monument at the $\frac{1}{4}$ section corner of sections 21 and 28 which the BLM reestablished in 1960, and you found to be approximately 25 feet from its proper position, we feel it should remain as is. This decision is based on (1) its length of existence, (2) the fact that its position was used by a 1977 private survey, and (3) its position does not constitute what we consider to be gross error.

Sincerely,

Bill

William W. Glenn
Chief, Branch of Cadastral Survey

FILED
RECEIVED

MAY 16 1984

COUNTY SURVEYOR
DOUGLAS COUNTY, ORE.

2014



United States Department of the Interior 9641.5 (942)

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

OREGON STATE OFFICE
P.O. Box 2965 (825 N.E. Multnomah Street)
Portland, Oregon 97208February 9, 1984
FILED
RECEIVED *BS*

MAY 16 1984

COUNTY SURVEYOR
DOUGLAS COUNTY, ORE.

Mr. James W. Prochnau
Jackson & Prochnau Inc.
P. O. Box 177
Albany, Oregon 97321

Dear Mr. Prochnau:

This is in response to your letter dated January 30, 1984, concerning survey procedure in T. 21 S., R. 11 W., Willamette Meridian, Oregon.

The problem you have posed is not to calculate the position for the southeast corner of section 34, but rather to restore the meander corner of sections 34 and 35. The point for the section corner mentioned in Byars' record falls in a meandered river and hence does not exist either in theory or practice.

The Manual (Section 5-40) prescribes that meander corners on lines projected across meandered bodies of water will usually be reestablished by single proportionate measurement (occasionally, by single point control), or in extreme cases, by adjustment of the record meanders. It also allows for special cases (Section 5-46) where the surveyor's experience and judgment may properly override or modify these principles.

In our opinion, the meander corner of sections 34 and 35 should, in this case, be reestablished at record bearing, South, from the original $\frac{1}{4}$ section corner of sections 34 and 35, and at record distance, 17.89 chains, from the $\frac{1}{4}$ section corner if this distance places the meander corner on or very near the present meander line. If the record distance falls close, but not on the meander line, the present shoreline may be treated "as an identified natural feature" (Section 5-40) and the meander corner reestablished on it.

There are many potential pitfalls in using control south of the river to restore the meander corner in question. You refer to some of these in your letter. Whenever possible, survey errors or discrepancies should be isolated where they "properly belong" (Section 5-23) and should not effect proportioning of lost corners beyond their immediate area. In line with this principle, projecting Byars' survey across the river through his 23.22 chain triangulation would probably introduce more error than using his 17.89 chain tie to the $\frac{1}{4}$ section corner.

③ of 4

In addition, it makes little sense to extend possible distortion from questionable corners, which are 74 to 96 chains away, across a river, and in another township, when the original $\frac{1}{4}$ section corner of sections 34 and 35 is much closer, probably more reliable, and in the same township. While certain aspects of Haines' work are debatable, it is not necessary to pass judgment on his survey one way or another, as the method we suggest for restoring the meander corner ignores his survey and conforms to the Manual.

A second best solution might be to reestablish the meander corner by single proportionate measurement between the corner of sections 3 and 10, T. 22 S., R. 11 W., and the $\frac{1}{4}$ section corner of sections 34 and 35, since these two seem generally accepted as original corners. From your data, it appears that such a restoration would place the meander corner about 8 links south and 30 links west of a point at record bearing and distance from the $\frac{1}{4}$ section corner of sections 34 and 35. The two locations are favorably related and tend to confirm one another, but all things considered, a single point control restoration is preferable.

We hope that this information is helpful to you.

Sincerely,

Bill

William W. Glenn
Chief, Branch of Cadastral Survey

cc: Dennis Moonier
Larry Hunnemuller

FILED
RECEIVED *BS*
MAY 16 1984
COUNTY SURVEYOR
DOUGLAS COUNTY, ORE.

of 4