Analysis of the One Quarter Corner to Sections 34 and 3
T3 & 4N, R9W (see separate plat)
Reference County B.T. Records Pg. 273-18
Reference County Survey No. B-7742, COR. No. 16

(KARL FOESTE)

After reviewing Carl Foestes' survey record of Section 34, T4N R9W C.S. B-7742 where he disputed Paul L. Thompson's location of the one quarter corner between Sections 34 and 3, T3 and 4N R9W W.M., we visited the location. We wanted to decide whether Foeste's location was superior to Paul Thompson's which is described in County B.T. Records Pg. 273-18.

Carl Foestes, Harold Russell, Allen Duncan, Wes Shlenker, A. Hofmann and myself visted this site on July 12, 1983 and Carl Foestes, A. Hofmann, Dave Buchholz and myself revisted the site on August 17, 1983.

Attached is a plat of the topographic calls I have mapped from notes taken on August 17, 1983.

My evaluations and conclusions are:

The remains that Foestes calls original B.T.s show nothing to indicate they were B.T.s. The cedar snag was in good enough shape that there should have been some indication of an old face. I would judge this tree to have been much larger than the original call of 44" in diameter if the diameter was taken standing on the side which was supposed to be faced. The hemlock was in very poor shape with no indication as to where it came from, or as to what size it might have been.

Foestes evaluation of the remains of the original B.T. at Paul Thompson's corner in that is was too small, is not supportible. It is now down and in poor shape. I measured the remains to have been approximately 40" in diameter without bark and loss of sap wood.

The creek calls Foestes diagrammed in his report agree closely with what I have on my plat, but he fails to note that this creek has wandered all over the bottom land in recent history, and that Paul Thompson's corner fits the original calls as well as his in most locations, if the wanderings of this creek are considered.

The only call that doesn't support Thompson's position is the call of 36.50 chains East of Section corner 3, 4, 33 and 34 (touch N. edge of creek same as last given). Foestes line passes this call at the top of an approximately 10' high bank sloping from the north that shows recent erosion and undermining of old tree remains. I doubt that Foestes line would have fit the call which could have originally been miscalled as a position approximately 1 chain West would have fit much better.

Foestes line crosses the creek at 240 West and 340' West of his one quarter corner. Neither were calls in the original survey. Both of these crossings are at the bottom of a steep slope rising to the south, so the creek couldn't have been any further south and was probably further north than it is now. The state's line misses both of these crossings.

See Map B-1138