

**INDEX OF DISCREPANCIES FOUND  
IN FIELD NOTES & SURVEY PLATS**

[Current through: 1/24/2011]

**NORTH AND EAST**

<u>Legal Description</u>	<u>Discrepancy</u>
<u>T. 1 N., R. 4 E.</u>	The bearing from the W $\frac{1}{2}$ cor. sec. 31 to the sec. cor. common to secs. 25, 30, 31, 36 should be N., 0° 35 E. as per FNs.
<u>T. 1 N., R. 5 E.</u>	Bearing between secs. 12 & 7 Ranges 4 & 5 E. should be N. 0° 04' W. as shown the T. 1 N., R. 4 E. plat. The T. 1 N., R.5 E. plat incorrectly reports this bearing as N. 0° 04' E. which does not conform with the FNs. Parentheticals N $\frac{1}{2}$ W. bdy. sec 6 are reversed.
<u>T. 1 N., R. 6 E.</u>	Problem with proportioning N. bdy. bet. secs. 1 & 36. June 30, 1906 plat of 2 N., R. 6 E. shows S. bdy. sec. 36 (W. $\frac{1}{2}$ 39.75 chs. - E. $\frac{1}{2}$ 39.65 chs.). Later resurvey T. 1 N., R. 6 E., N. bdy. sec. 1 put $\frac{1}{4}$ cor. at midpoint & called it common (Mar. 20, 1943 plat). 1943 $\frac{1}{4}$ cor. marked as common should only function as $\frac{1}{4}$ for sec. 1, T. 1 N., R. 6 E., only.
<u>T. 1 N., R. 9 E.</u> (8/29/91)	The Tp. bdy. bet. T. 1 N., R. 9 E., and T. 1 S., R. 9 E., was dependently resurveyed in 1938 by George M. Kurtzweil. He also completely resurveyed both Tps. The FNs and Tp. plat of T. 1 S., R. 9 E., reflect dists. of 40.18 (W. $\frac{1}{2}$ ), 40.08 (E. $\frac{1}{2}$ ) and 6.90 for $\frac{1}{4}$ cor. offset for the S. bdy. of sec. 32, T. 1 N., R. 9 E. The Tp. plat of T. 1 N., R. 9 E., reflects dists. of 40.13 (W. $\frac{1}{2}$ ), 40.13 (E. $\frac{1}{2}$ ) and 6.85 for $\frac{1}{4}$ cor. offset
<u>T. 1 N., R. 9 E.</u> (4/8/93)	S. bdy. = Base Line and was not resurveyed with resurvey for 1943 plat. S. bdy. is a copy of 1940 plat 1S., 9E.. Problem is 1943 plat 1N., 9E. copies S. bdy., sec. 32, wrong. 1N., 9E. shows dist. on S. bdy. sec. 32, as split 40.13 - 40.13. 1940 plat 1S., 9E., shows Dists. 40.18 - 40.08. Falling wrong also.
<u>T. 1 N., R. 18 E.</u>	The bearing (from corner #2 to corner #3) quadrant is incorrect and is inconsistent with the FNs.
<u>T. 2 N., R. 9 E.</u> (4/22/93)	Between secs. 13 & 24, there are dbl. $\frac{1}{4}$ cors. The plat shows a tie between these dbl. $\frac{1}{4}$ cors. of 71 Lks., which should read 1.71 Lks. Notes call for $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 13 at 40.05 = Midpoint = Midpoint in Dep. for this mile. 41.76 - 40.05 = 1.71 lks. This does not agree with plat.
<u>T. 2 N., R. 9 E.</u> (11/18/93)	Distance between $\frac{1}{4}$ 's, secs. 13 & 24, shown on the plat as 0.71 chs., FNs depict 1.71 chs.
<u>T. 2 N., R. 18 E.</u>	(Sec 23), (Recv'd from Sawtooth Engineering) Our measurements indicate that CE

1/16th is off line approx. 18' to the S. & approx. 5' from split between C $\frac{1}{4}$  & E $\frac{1}{4}$ . Also NE 1/16th is off from record. Approx. 6' N.-S. & approx. 20' E.-W.

T. 2 N., R. 35 E. This plat shows 5.77 chs. offset bet. sec. cors. to secs. 24 & 25, T. 2 N., R. 35 E., and secs. 19 & 30, T. 2 N., R. 36 E., the 1915 (Bardsley & Coffin) FNs say 6.77 chs.

T. 3 N., R. 5 E. The dist. & brg. shown (10.26 chs. N.) from the SE Tp. cor. to the Tp. CC of Tps. 2 & 3N., Rgs. 5 & 6E., is incorrect and should reflect the 1914 Spofford/Bates survey info (N. 0° 33' W., 10.24 chs.).

T. 3 N., R. 17 E. The portion of Silver Moon lode MS 398 N. of the Tp. line and W. of the line between secs. 33-34 does not close. It looks like Forsyth & Sevy's tie from the line between secs. 33-34 to Cor. 2 of Silver Moon lode should have been 6.79 instead of 3.79. Using 3.79 gives misclosure .222 N./2.985. Using 6.79 gives closure .013/.008.

T. 3 N., R. 41 E. Beginning at the cor. of secs. 1 and 12 only, on the E. bdy., the FNs have 13.325 to the S. 1/16th of sec. 6. The plat has 12.325. It appears the plat is correct because it gives 19.985 for the 1/16th.

T's. 3 & 4 N., R's. 40 & 41 E.

Report of Finding... a memo drafted by Timothy A. Quincy, Cadastral Surveyor, dated August, 2000, referenced a phone conversation he had with Mr. Dale Ashcraft, a Party Chief with Benton Engineering (208) 522-8033. The phone call was on 8/18/00. Mr. Ashcraft recovered the 1910 township corner while conducting a search for a 60-penny nail set for the township corner during a 1960 dependent resurvey. The nail was not found. Ashcraft stated his intent to file a CP&F.

T. 4 N., R. 3 E. There are offset corners along the sec. line between secs. 34 and 35 due to resurveyed S.  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile with bearing 1° 57' (cardinal equivalents). The resurvey was done as part of a completion survey including section 35. The draftsman graphically depicts as offset  $\frac{1}{4}$  section corner between secs. 34 and 35. Sec. 34 - OS 1892. Sec. 35 - CS 1908.

A subsequent 1962 re-monumentation of the original  $\frac{1}{4}$  sec. corner (which now functions as  $\frac{1}{4}$  corner sec. 34 only) marked the brass cap as the  $\frac{1}{4}$  corner for both sec. 34 and 35.

T. 4 N., R. 6 E. The error is in the FNs Vol. 304, pg. 109 of the notes, not the Vol. The meanders in sec. 24, rt. Bank of the Boise River have a course N. 20° W., 11.20 chs. dist.. It should read N. 20° E.. The NW part of the sec. miscloses by over 7 chs. By changing the bearing of the one leg it closes good and the plotted meanders follow the contour of the river on the quad.

T. 4 N., R. 40 E. Found on plat. Lot 13 in sec. 23; lot 15 in sec. 25; and, lot 19 in sec. 26

mis-close.

- T. 4 N., R. 40 E. Discrepancy: Both Lat/Longs shown on the plat are identical. Lat: 43°38'38.884"N, Long: 111°42'10.717"W. From CAPD: The northerly one that is shown near a fence (GCDB pt. ID 801130) is correct. The one on the south along the section line (GCDB pt.ID 624200) should be: Lat: 43°38'27.9734"N, Long: 111°41'58.6053"W
- T. 5 N., R. 5 E. FNs, Vol. (unspecified), pg. 459, Dependent Resurvey of a portion of the subdivisional lines T. 5 N., R. 5 E. "From this cor. [CC secs. 7, 8, 17, 18] the ¼ cor. of secs. 7 and 8, bears..." Should read "¼ cor. of secs. 17 & 18..." Also, on same pg. FNs read "From this cor., Cor. No. 6, Bonaparte Placer, Mineral Survey No. 2106, bears N. 63°15' W." Should read "N. 63°15' E."
- T. 5 N., R. 11 E. MS542A, MS1174, MS542B, MS543A, MS542B
- T. 5 N., R. 38 E. N. bdy. sec. 6, shows total of 79.08. It should be 78.18. The same holds true with the rest of the bdy. [see notes for further discussion]
- T. 6 N., R. 38 E. An error in the field notes for the 2002 Dep. Resurvey. Field Notes, Page 50, 2000 survey of meanders of the left bank, sec. 36, tie from the 2000 meander corner to the 1/4 sec cor. "5.955 chs. dist" This is Incorrect. The correct dist. is 6.70 chs as shown on the plat. Field Notes, Pages 6-7 show the correct dist along the Std. Parallel (S. Bndry sec. 6)
- T. 7 N., R. 4 E. Appears to be a transposed distance for N. ½ mile, W. bdy., sec. 6, T. 7 N., R. 4 E., dtd Jun. 5, 1985. The distance returned by G.M.Kurtzweil in 1924 was 35.77 chs., not 35.37 chs. as depicted on the 1985 plat.
- T. 7 N., R. 40 E. & 41 E. Report of parentheticals between secs. 1 & 6. Depicted parentheticals are reversed from each plat. In protecting acreages in sec. 1, T. 7 N., R. 40 E., (1879 Carter & David, O.S.) Good's proportionate positions for the North 1/16's between secs. 1 & 6 were incorrectly placed on the plat adjoining. These errors were further perpetuated into plats: supplemental plat, sec. 1, T. 7 N., R. 40 E. approved Jan. 17, 1984, and Don Duren's DR & Survey in sec. 6, T. 7 N., R. 41 E. approved Jan. 28, 1981.
- T. 8 N., R. 1 E. Distances for the mile between secs. 3 & 4 are incorrect for sec. 3 in the N. ½ mile. Should be 19.536 & 15.824 respectfully, not 20.00 & 15.36 chs., as shown on the composite.
- T. 8 N., R. 5 E. Found in the FNs. Vol. 416, pg. 444, the bearings of the ties to the meander line differ from the bearings on pg. 450 when the meander lines are actually run. GCDB used the bearings on pg. 450.
- T. 8 N., Rs. 38, 39 E. Discrepancy in the Plat filed 02/17/2012. There are offset corners for the N1/16 corner of sec 1, T8N, R39E. The distances reported on the plat should have been

shown for sec. 6 only.

- T. 8 N., R. 41 E. Lot 8 (island), sec. 32. In the FNs Vol. 401, pg. 113, the bearing S. 39° 06' E., 4.12 chs. is incorrect. It should be changed to S. 39° 06' W.
- T. 9 N., R. 9 E. On the E. bdy. of sec. 1 the plat shows a dist. of 55.50. The FNs Vol. 256, pg. 637 has 55.56 chs. The plat of T. 9 N., R. 10 E. also has 55.56 chs.
- T. 9 N., R. 22 E. Bearing and distance on the S. bdy. of sec. 34, is wrong. It comes from the plat dtd. Nov. 2, 1891. This line was resurveyed in T. 8 N., R. 22 E., by Walt Good as shown on the plat accepted Mar. 13, 1956. Also, the suppl. plat T. 8 N., R. 22 E. is wrong. The N. bdy. sec. 2, comes from the plat accepted Mar. 13, 1956. This line was resurveyed in T. 9 N., R. 22 E. by Don Duren Jan. 15, 1971.
- T. 9 N., R. 22 E. Problem with geographic calls along the S. ½ mile of W. bdy. sec. 22. [see notes]
- T. 9 N., R. 37 E. Lot 2, sec. 30, acreage is incorrect. Lot 4, sec. 6, acreage could very well be 37.80 acres not 35.80 acres.
- T. 12 N., R. 19 E. The last ½ mile on the Tp. bdy., sec. 31, should read 41.36, and not 31.36 as shown on the plat.
- T. 12 N., R. 25 E. Offset dist. of S¼ of sec. 35 (T. 13 N., R. 25 E.) to the NE cor. sec. 3 should be 1 lk; correction to 61 lks. on protracted diagram.
- T. 12 N., R. 38 E. Protraction Diagram #69. Subtracting Southerly through protracted secs. 6, 7, 18, 19, 30, & 31, T. 13 N., R. 38 E. increased dists. by 0.24 lks. thus, theoretically making the dist. for the S. bdy. of sec. 31, 80.00 chs. in T. 13 N., R. 38 E. The 80.00 chs. - 18.42 chs. (tie from the CC set by J.B. David in 1882) + 32.32 chs. (tie from the CC for the NE sec. cor. 3, T. 12 N., R. 38 E., against the Std. Parallel) yields 93.90 chs. for the dist. on the N. bdy. of sec. 6, T. 12 N., R. 38 E., an excess of 15.60 chs.
- T. 14 N., R. 21 E. Found on plat. Parenthetical distance - N. Tp. bdy. - lot 4. Shown on the plat as 15.47 chs. should be 16.49 chs.
- T. 14 N., R. 22 E. Found on plat. The bearing between secs. 20 & 29 on the plat shows S. 89° 51' E., on pg. 496, Vol. 119, FNs calls S. 89° 51' W.
- T. 14 N., R. 24 E. Found in the FNs. Vol. 401, pg. 681 (1965 Otto T. Kruger Jr.) West bdy. sec. 31, T. 14 N., R. 24 E., calls N. 0° 15' E., between secs. 31 & 36 from the Tp. cor. ¼ cor. sec. 36, T. 14 N., R. 23 E., while pg. 687 calls N. 0° 15' W. along the same line.
- T. 14 N., R. 25 E. On the line bet. secs. 19 & 30 the diagram shows the falling to be .93

chs. N. 0° 02' E. of the cor. of secs. 24 and 25 for R. 24 E. FNs Vol. 401, pg. 683 shows the CC of 19 and 30 to be S. 0° 13' E. .94 chs. from the cor. of secs. 24 and 25. This leaves the mile for sec.19 to be 81.87 chs.

- T. 15 N., R. 25 E. HES 146 survey shows dist. of 22.60 bet. cors. 1 & 6. 1916 supplemental plat shows dist. of 20.60.
- T. 16 N., R. 20 E. MC's incorrectly proportion in South boundary sec. 34. Appears that the resurvey data from the 1911 O.S. for T. 15 N., R. 20 E., (by Smith, Fenley, & Perkins) was utilized instead of the record done by James M. Porter 1892 in T. 16 N., R. 20 E.
- T. 17 N., R. 22 E. The dist. shown on the protracted diagram from the NE Tp. cor. to the std. ¼ sec. cor. along the S. bdy. of sec. 36 in T. 18 N., differs by 1 ch. as surveyed by Walter Good in 1950.
- T. 20 N., R. 22 E. 1988 Dependent Resurvey and Subdivision of sec. 7, T. 20 N., R. 22 E. An error in the quadrant of one meander course was discovered during the running of PCCS on T. 20 N., R. 22 E., for the GCDB section. The course is shown graphically correct on the plat of said resurvey, but the FNs are incorrect. The course as shown in the FNs, S. 7°18' W., 7.06 chs., is part of the adjusted original (1891) meanders of the left bank of the Salmon River. The correct bearing should be S. 7°18' E. and was verified during the PCCS process. Also the geographic position on the sec. cor. of secs. 7 & 8 only, as determined from the tie given in the FNs and shown on the plat, differs from what's shown on the plat by almost 2 degrees in latitude and 17 seconds in longitude.
- T. 22 N., R. 22 E. In the process of abstracting the data along the 5th Std. Parallel through R. 22 E., an error was discovered in the latest resurvey along the S. bdy. of secs. 31 & 32, T. 22 N., R. 22 E. [see notes]
- T. 24 N., R. 2 E. Supplemental plat of sec. 21, approved 11/3/59, E. side of sec. 21, shows 5.26 across River and 40.01 for S. ½ mile between secs. 21-22. Should be 5.25 across the river and 40 chain ½ mile.
- T. 24 N., R. 2 E. Deed description for Parcel #1 located in lots 5, 6, and 8, sec. 18, course S. 83° 40' 00" W., 368.97 feet should be S 83° 40' 00" E., 368.97 feet to have parcel #1 close. Description is dated 5/12/92.
- T. 24 N., R. 7 E. Protraction Diagram No. 42 shows 81.94 chs. for E. bdy. of sec. 36 T. 24 N., R. 7 E. This does not conform with the survey of sec. 33/34 line.
- T. 29 N., R. 1 E. The bearing along the standard W. ½ of sec. 35, sec. 34 should be N. 89°55' W. and the bearing for sec. 33 should be S. 89°58' W. The resurvey of the standard is in the FNs of T. 30 N., R. 1 E. and the plat approved 1/23/70 for that Tp. matches the FNs.

T. 30 N., R. 4 E.

The Dep Res established the S. 1/16th and ¼ cors. as common bet. secs. 30 & 25 on the W. bdy. They should be offset. The cors. for sec. 25 should be at proportionate dist. bet. the AP and the sec. cor. to the S. Original record was 80.00 chs. with 2.94 chs. bet. the AP and the CC. In 1906 when R. 4 E. was subdivided the distances became 40, 40, to the sec. cor. for sec. 30 and then .88 to the AP and then 2.94 to the CC for sec. 25. In 1987 the distances became 19.76 to the common S. 1/16th, 19.76 to the common ¼, 19.76 to the 1/16th for sec. 30, 19.76 to the sec. cor. for sec. 30, .71 to the AP, and 3.18 to the CC for sec. 25. We think the corners are not common for the S. 1/16th and the ¼ cor. The ¼ cor. for sec. 25 should go at midpoint between the AP and the sec. cor. of 25, 30, 31 & 36.

T. 32 N., R. 7 E.

Cuddy and Associates, Ben Johnson, Idaho PLS No. 11593, during the course of retracement of the section line between sections 4 and 5, recovered the N 1/16 sec. cor. established by BLM in 1978, under Idaho Group 574, and determined that it was incorrectly monumented to the south of true position by 32 feet distance. See copy of Cuddy's ROS filed in the Discrepancy File.

T. 32 N., R. 12 E.

(Recv'd fm Eli & Assoc.) Our firm was hired to locate & perpetuate the cors. of H.E.S. 460... We encountered one cor. that seems to be different than the 1916 FNs. Cor. #8 seems to be in error - or better yet - the course between cor. #8 & cor. #9 seems to be the problem, we find S. 71°24' E., 2.13 chs. vs. record (1916) of N. 71°24' E., 2.13 chs.

T. 40 N., R. 11 E.

Duren Plat approved 7/27/70, line depicted as 2-3, Sailor Gulch Placer, has wrong bearing pulled from plat of MS 3525. Duren plat has S. 89° 30' 40" W. Should be S. 86° 30' 40" W. (line 2-3 was not resurveyed by Duren).

T. 48 N., R. 3 E.

**[1st]** In the field notes for M.S. 3202 A & B, surveyed by Hall in 1929, on pg. 23, Hall states that he finds the bearing and distance from the CC for secs. 11, 12, 13, & 14, to the ¼ corner of secs. 11 and 14 to be N. 89°10'24" W., 2611.50 ft. dist. instead of S. 89°51' W., 2634.72 as shown in the notes. The problem is that on the plat dated November 1, 1967 (SURVEY OF TRACT 37, SECTION 9 AND TRACT 38 SECTION 11) the entire mile between section 11 and 14 has a bearing of S. 89°51' W. with a distance of 79.85 chs. (from the 1891 plat I presume, since it's the same). The distance referred to in the mineral survey misses this 1891 record by a link (?). **[2nd]** On sheet 1 of MS 3202 A & B the bearing and distance referred to above is shown as stated in the notes. On sheet 2 the bearing is shown correctly but the distance is shown as 2671.50 (should be 2611.50). **[3rd]** The bearing Hall reports in 1929 from the CC for secs. 11, 12, 13, & 14, to the ¼ cor. of secs. 12 & 13 is N. 89°51'

E. [4th] In the notes for M.S. 3220, on pg. 21, is reference to the bearing and dist. between secs. 13 & 14. It states finding the bearing of the line to be N. 0°48' E., 2655.44 ft. rather than N. 0°02' W., 2640 ft. as reported. I can't read the bearing on the plat for this line - but it sure doesn't appear to be 0°02'.

T. 49 N., R. 1 E.

N. ½ mile, W. bdy. sec. 6. Parentheticals should be placed on the W. side of the Tp. line for sec. 1, T. 49 N., R. 1 W.

T. 49 N., R. 5 E.

M.S. 2466 in secs. 8 and 9 mislabeled on 2013 Dep. Res. Plat by S.Tate; Plat reads 2246 should be 2466.

T. 52 N., R. 2 E. & 3 E.

There is a disputed N 1/16th corner on the sec. line between secs. 1 and 6. The first 1/16th corner was set during a 1914 resurvey by E.R. Johnson. In 1923 A.O. Modlin surveyed H.E.S. 804. As part of this survey he retraced the section line between secs. 1 and 6. Modlin rejected Johnson's N 1/16th and set his own, new, 1/16th and redesignated Johnson's 1/16th as corner 16 of H.E.S. 218 and corner 2 of H.E.S. 804 without giving any reason for his actions.

T. 55 N., R. 2 E.

contract  
is

During 1976 BLM Dependent Resurvey, the East ¼ corner for sec. 1 was re-established by proportion. The recorded plat for a 1991 USFS survey indicates the original ¼ cor. was found and all sec.subdivision relative to this found original corner.

## **SOUTH AND EAST**

T. 1 S., R. 8 E. (9/5/91)

Parenthetical dists. on the N. ½ of the W. bdy. sec. 18, are swapped. See lotting on the 1911 completion survey by F.N. Ropp & L.G. Diehl.

T. 1 S., R. 8 E. (4/22/94)

Along the W. bdy. of sec. 18, the Dep. Res. reversed the parenthetical distances. The N½ of sec. 18 was lotted to the S. on the orig. plat.

T. 1 S., R. 11 E.

11/08/1871 - Draftsman computed N. bdy. of sec. 6, as being 80 chs. (40/20/20) when it should have been 77.69 chs. (40/20/17.69).

T. 1 S., R. 12 E. (4/9/93)

The N. bdy. of sec. 6 comprises lots 1-4, each lot is shown to be 20 acres, however the mile calculates to 77.58.

T. 1 S., R. 12 E. (6/12/91)

The plat shows 80 chs. dist. for N. bdy. of sec. 6 (40 chs., 20 chs., 20 chs.). If the 80 chs. dist. for the S. bdy. of sec. 31, T. 1 N., R. 12 E., and the (2) closing cor. offsets (11.83 & 14.25) are used to compute the N. bdy. of sec. 6, the dist. is 77.58 chs.

T. 1 S., R. 12 E. (11/25/91)

1/15/1872 - Draftsman computed N. bdy. of sec. 6, as being 80 chs. (40/20/20) when it should have been 77.58 (40/20/17.58).

- T. 1 S., R. 13 E. 1/15/1872 - Draftsman computed N. bdy. of sec. 6, as being 80 chs. (40/20/20) when it should have been 75.22 (40/20/15.22).
- T. 1 S., R. 14 E. 1/15/1872 - Draftsman computed N. bdy. of sec. 6, as being 80 chs. (40/20/20) when it should have been 77.76 (40/20/17.76) or 78.57 (40/20/18.57).
- T. 1 S., R. 15 E. Draftsman computed N. bdy. of sec. 6, as being 80 chs. (40/20/20) when it should have been 79.39 (40/20/19.39).
- T. 2 S., R. 34 E. Dist. E. bdy. sec. 1, should be 80.30 for total.
- T. 2 S., R. 36 E. Email from Tom Spencer dated 3/5/2008, re: John B. David 1873 original survey.
- T. 2 S., R. 43 E. The offset distance on the plat for the ¼ sec. cor. of sec. 36 on the S. bdy. should be 0.12 rather than 1.12.
- T. 2 & 3 S., R. 6 E. (9/4/91) The Tp. line bet. Tps. 2 & 3 S., R. 6 E., was surveyed by T.W. Randall in 1870. Both plats return 82.00 chs. for the mile bet. secs. 31 & 6. Lotting conforms to the 82.00 chs. in both Tps. The FNs (Vol. 19) T.W. Randall do not agree (80.75 chs.).
- T. 2 & 3 S., R. 6 E. (6/12/91) Line bet. secs. 6/31 - Plats have 82.00. Vol. 19, pgs. 330-331 have 80.75 chs. GCDB used 82.00.
- T. 3 S., R. 46 E. Discrepancy in bearing, reported as N. 0° 27' E., from MP 147 to the CC for secs. 27 & 34. Plat shows N. 0° 27' W. FNs Vol. 440, page 225. [Group 798]
- T. 3 S., R. 46 E. (8/22/96) From the CC secs. 9-16, T. 36 N., R. 119 W., 6th PM to CC secs. 27-34, T. 3 S., R. 46 E., BM, Notes say N. 27' E. Plat says N. 27' W. Plat bearing appears correct.
- Adjusted rec. meanders for right bank in sec. 9 (p. 264) the 1st (3) courses down stream from the MC secs. 9-10 on p. 263, vol. 440 under the heading "from MC 15/22 on left bank in sec. 22." The adjusted courses are S. 50°27' W., 4.01; S. 82°44' W., 4.01; S. 66°07' W., 8.32.
- T. 4 S., R. 4 E. The W. 1/16th on the S. bdy. of sec. 31, was set using the 1875 original survey of T. 4 S., R. 4 E., parentheticals to proportion it in. It was marked as the W. 1/16th between secs. 31, and sec. 6, T. 5 S., R. 4 E., but should only control sec. 31, due to the 1893 original survey of T. 5 S., R. 4 E., establishing an offset W. 1/16th on the N. bdy. of sec. 6.
- T. 4 S., R. 14 E. The dist. (78.12 chs.) bet. secs. 3 & 4 should be 78.72 chs. Verified with checks against acreages and FNs.
- T. 5 S., R. 16 E. The bearing from the cor. of secs. 32 & 33 to the ¼ cor. of sec. 32, T. 4 S.,



R. 16 E. has been transposed. The bearing as stated in the FNs and shown on the plat for T. 4 S., R. 16 E., is N. 89°54' W., not N. 89°45' W., as shown on the subject plat.

T. 5 S., R. 19 E.

The ¼ cor. for sec. 6, T. 6 S., R. 19 E., is shown falling on the wrong side of the ¼ for sec. 31, T. 5 S., R. 19 E., (S. bdy.) it should be to the East.

T. 5 S., R. 34 E.

Memo to Group 778 from Doug Welman. Field visit with Dan Thompson, Shoshone Bannock tribal surveyor. Recovered U. S. Indian Service iron post.

T. 5 S., R. 45 E.

The dist. of the sec. line bet. secs. 5 & 8, is shown on the plat as 78.98. It should read 79.98.

T. 6 S., R. 4 E.

A discrepancy was found between the computed tie (in lat. & long.) and the digitized position on the ¼ cor. between secs. 19 & 20. The tie was made from U.S.C. & G.S. 3rd order tri-station "Conical." The digitized position falls N. 60°04'43" E., 6.487 chs. of the computed position. The digitized position better correlates between the plat information and found digitized cor. positions. Computed tie: Lat. 42°53'12.9868" Long. 116°01'00.2278". Digitized: Lat. 42°53'15.0994" Long. 116°00'55.2459"

T. 6 S., R. 14 E.

The N. bdy. of sec. 29 shows a bearing of S. 89°45' W. on the plat which is incorrect. The FNs show S. 89°34' W.

T. 6 S., R. 34 E.

The ties (from AP 6, tract 38, sec. 7 and AP 1, tract 39, sec. 8) to the ¼ sec. cor. of secs. 7 and 8, as shown on the official plats and field notes (R Vol. 497, page 104), filed 2/5/2010, should have been noted as being the ¼ sec. cor. of sec. 7 only, not as being common ¼ sec. cor. of secs. 7 and 8. See 1901 Sonnenkalb completion survey of sec. 8. The distance, as shown on the official 2/5/2010 records (plat and field notes), is correct and was to the correct ¼ sec. cor. per the CP&F record filed in 2000 by John Elle, Idaho PLS 4440, filed in Bannock Co., under Inst. No. 20003148.

T. 7 S., R. 20 E.

Dell Cazier resurveyed the 1st Std. Parallel S. (N. bdy. of T. 7 S., R. 20 E.) and reported the dist. from the Std. Tp. cor. of T. 6 S., R. 19 & 20 E., to the closing cor. of secs. 4 & 5, T. 7 S., R. 20 E., to be 23.30 chs. He then subdivided T. 7 S., R. 20 E., and when setting the closing cor. for secs. 4 & 5, he gave a falling of 23.20 chs. to the std. Tp. cor. The plat also shows 23.20. I don't know which is actually correct except 23.20 will make a slightly better closure around sec. 5 and sec. 4; there are (2) 23.20's to only (1) 23.20. We told the contractor to use 23.20.

that  
plus

T. 7 S., R. 22 E.

The parenthetical dist. (26.88 chs.) on the S. bdy. sec. 6, should be 21.88 chs.

- T. 7 S., R. 35 E. Difference bet. plat and FNs for the line bet. secs. 22 & 27. The FNs have the correct dist. of 39.32 chs. for the W. ½ mile (the plat had 39.92 chs.).
- T. 8 S., R. 13 E. The dist. shown on the plat bet. cor. for secs. 31 & 32 and the closing cor. of secs. 5 & 6 on the S. bdy. of T. 8 S., R. 13 E., is 2.52 chs. The dist. should be 2.57 chs. which is what is called for in the FNs for T. 8 S., R. 13 E., and the FNs and plat for T. 9 S., R. 13 E.
- T. 9 S., R. 14 E. The bearing shown on the plat (bet. A.P. #1 and A.P. #2 the re-established meander line on the rt. bank of the Snake River in sec. 1) should be S. 27°14' W. not N. 27°14' W. as substantiated by the FNs (Vol. 325).
- T. 9 S., R. 21 E. Vol. 387, pg. 180, FNs of suppl. survey of Farm Units, description of control. Tie from USC&GS tri station "Cinder" is to ¼ cor. of secs. 2 & 11, T. 9 S., R. 20 E., not sec. cor.
- T. 9 S., R. 30 E. Acreage for lot 3, sec. 7, is incorrect. Acreage should be 35.75 instead of 37.75. Acreages for lotting in sec. 4 do not fit parentheses.
- T. 10 S., R. 12 E. The plat of survey for Mike Dress' 10/21-29/97 dependent resurvey and subdivision of sec. 10, contains an error. The tie from the NE corner of sec. 10 to the north, to the common corner of secs. 2, 3, 34 & 35 shows sec. 2, west of 3, and 35 west of 34.
- T. 10 S., R. 18 E. It appears the Lat. (at least) for the SE corner may be in error. We get the same Lat. for the CC for secs. 4, 5, 8, & 9, as the plat shows for secs. 12, & 13.
- T. 11 S., R. 21 E. Bad tie from USC&GS tri station "Broom" to ¼ cor. of secs. 17 & 20, T. 11 S., R. 21 E. (no further information provided).
- T. 11 S., R. 35 E. Suppl. plat, sec. 2. Discrepancy bet. bearing shown on suppl. plat for sec. 2, E. ½ N. bdy. dtd Nov. 2, 1917, and suppl. plat secs. 2 & 3, dtd Nov. 6, 1915. The 1917 plat bearing of N. 89°59' E. appears to be wrong. It should be N. 89°39' E. The plat these suppls. were derived from shows N. 89°39' E.
- T. 12 S., R. 10 E. Survey Plat shows that a Witness Point set on a metes-and-bound survey line in sec. 33 reads: "S\32" cap should obviously read "S\33". Office assumption is that the actual cap probably reads correctly.

- T. 13 S., R. 3 E. On running the unadjusted evaluated a misclosure was detected in secs. 19 & 20, resulting in the following closures: comparisons: bearing on plat N. 0°21' W., sec. 19 - radial 1.485 chs., sec. 20 - 1.502 chs. Reverse bearing to N. 0°21' E., sec. 19 - radial .503 chs., sec. 20 - radial .52 chs. Secs. 17, 18, 19, & 20, were blocked out to keep the error isolated.
- T. 13 S., R. 4 E In running the unadjusted evaluator, a misclosure was detected in secs. 19 & 30. The plat and notes were compared and found to be different. The plat showed a bearing of S. 89°00' W. (which was used in the evaluator) and the notes read N. 89°00'W. The bearing as shown in the FN's was held to prepare the data base.
- T. 14 S., R. 17 E. Drafting error. The N. ½ mile W. bdy. of sec. 6, dist. should be 39.97 chs. The FN's (Smith & Ropp) reflects the same, however, the plat shows 33.97 chs.
- T. 14 S., R. 32 E. Control Station "Look" should have a longitude of 112 43 not 42. Control Station "Meadows" should be "Meadow" no s. (Full name is "Meadow USGS 1968")
- T. 14 & 15 S., R. 44 E. Protraction Diagram 104. Bet. secs. 1 & 35, there are (2) Meander Corners. The protraction diagram has left out (1) MC (the MC for sec. 1, T. 15 S., R. 44 E. **Note:** For the GCDB product we used record information (1946 plat). This is contrary to the protraction diagram. At such time as this discrepancy is dealt with please inform GCDB staff, at which time we will correct our product. Copy in Tech. Direction Bk., Task 6. **Note:** This solution creates gross error in our product, flagged it as a problem area for GCDB users.
- T. 15 S., R. 2 E. Plat shows a dist. of 40.06 chs. for the N. ½ mile bet. secs. 14 & 15. FN's show a dist. of 40 chs. The plat & FN's are from an Independent Resurvey.
- T. 15 S., R. 32 E. W. 1/16th position - T. 15 S., R. 32 E. N. bdy. sec. 6 (out by 1.80 chs. Easting) D.E. Harding mistakenly used Yundt/Crain survey data from T. 14 S., R. 32 E., neglecting the orig. dist. of 76.44 chs. across sec. 6, as surveyed for T. 15 S., R. 32 E., by J.B. David in 1877. New acreages were not returned.
- T. 16 S., R. 24 E. Difference bet plat dtd 7/9/56 and FN's for dist. bet. MP 132 & MP 133, Idaho-Utah bdy. Plat shows a dist. of 82.69 chs. FN's show dist. as 82.87 chs. 82.69 must be wrong.
- T. 16 S., R. 33 E. Subdivision of sec. 7 plat approved 12/4/85, the total length of the N.-S. centerline of the SW¼ should be 39.97 not 39.77 as is shown on the plat. The field notes are correct.

## NORTH AND WEST

### T. 2 N., R. 5 W.

Difference in policy when plats created this township, 1999 and 2006 plats affected. Section 21 lot 2 (W1/2NW1/4NW1/4). Looks like portion of area returned as aliquot to satisfy Court Order. Confusion on official description, incorrect description references on MTP dated 2015. Possible needs supp. plat to clear up description.

### T. 3 N., R. 5 W.

Found on Plat: Distance error on tie from the AMC on Rabbit Island to the local cor. of secs. 2, 3, 10, and 11. The distance shows 20.553, but should be 50.553.  
Also, the header for 43.1 Rabbit Island reads Tract 37, it should be Tract 38.

### T. 3 N., R. 6 W.

Found on plat. On the S. bdy. of T. 3 N., R. 6 E., the closing dist. of secs. 1 & 2, T. 2 N., R. 6 W., is shown as 2.07 chs. It should be 2.87 chs. to agree with the plat of T. 2 N., R. 6 W. dtd 3/1/1912 & the FNs of T. 2 N., R. 6 W.

### T. 17 N., R. 1 W.

Found on plat. Section line between secs. 6 & 7. Notation on plat reads S. 87° 47' E. should read N. 88° 47' E.

### T. 32 N., R. 4 W.

Amended plat of sec. 6, surveyed by Joseph P. Davis approved 5/13/20 component parts of the W. ½ mile on the S. side of sec. 31, do not add up to the total dist. on the plat of 40.23 chs.  $18.30 + 9.35 + 9.35 + 3.22 \neq 40.23$  chs. (= 40.22 chs.)

### T. 37 N., R. 4 W.

23 & 24,  
all

Suppl. plats wrongly shows offset secs. There is no way these secs. could be offset to extent shown on suppls. MTP is also wrong. This problem cannot be resolved without a resurvey. Surveys of Tp. bdys. shows no offsets on Tp. bdys. **1st** Surveyor from N. surveys S. and sets a cor. on Res. bdy. at all sec. lines (interiors). **2nd** Survey from S. surveys N. and says he sets cor., miles add up to 80 chs. in all cases, this is bet. secs. 22 & 23, and 21 & 22. **3rd** Surveyor from S. surveys N. and calls common cors. on Res. bdy. bet. secs. 20 & 21 and 19 & 20. Again miles add up to 80 chs.

It is really not clear what is going on bet. secs. 23/24, 22/23, 21/22.

### T. 47 N., R. 5 W.

Numerous errors exist in the Field Notes of the Dependent Resurvey of Portions of the West and North Boundaries, and of the Subdivisional Lines, and the Subdivision of Certain Sections executed by Belle Craig performed July 31 - September 30, 1996. See the Discrepancy File for a corrected copy of the field notes.

### T. 49 N., R. 1 W. & 2 W.

Range line between Tps. 49 N., Rs. 1 & 2 W. There are conflicts between the plat & notes of the Omeg & McArthur survey approved Feb. 15, 1908. Distances do not agree from the ¼ sec. 30 - ¼ sec. 18, T. 49 N., R. 1 W. and from ¼ sec. 6 - NW cor sec. 6, T 49 N., R. 1 W.

T. 49 N., R. 5 W. W. Clayton Miller's 1893 survey (plat approved Feb. 23, 1893) not shown on Index.

T. 54 N., R.4 W. The notes and plat of Sonnenkalbs measurement of the line between secs. 25-26 conflict. Plat states S 1° 38' W., 66.50; notes state S 1° 38' W., 66.80.

T. 55 N. & 56 N., R. 1 W. The area of concern is the Tp. line between sec. 31, T. 56 N., R. 1 W., and sec. 6, T. 55 N., R. 1 W. 1904 Original Survey of South bdy. sec. 31, T. 56 N., returned 40 & 40.40 = 80.40. 1906 Original Survey of N. bdy. sec. 6, T. 55 N., returned 40.20 & 40.20 = 80.40. N. bdy. was not retraced and draftsman created offset corners. 1911 NE¼ of sec. 6, patented as Homestead Entry. 1970 resurvey of Tp. line between sec. 31, and sec. 6 re-established ¼ cor. as common & established E. 1/16th & W. 1/16th as common using sec. 31, T. 56 N., R. 1 W., record.

T. 64 N., R. 2 W. Protraction Diagram No. 3 has 79.40 chs. for the W. bdy. of sec. 6, T. 64 N., R. 2 W., and 80.00 for the E. bdy. sec. 1, T. 64 N., R. 3 W. W.B. Kimmel's plat of T. 64 N., R. 2 W., approved 2/8/1911 shows the W. bdy. of sec. 6, as 75.87 chs. and the E. bdy. of sec. 1 as 79.40.

## **SOUTH AND WEST**

T. 1 S., R. 1 W. [Memo from Jerry Knight to Don Beck] This is in response to your question concerning the second meander course of the right bank of the Snake River in sec. 32, T. 1 S., R. 1 W.. The FNs approved July 2, 1990, have the bearing as S. 76°20' W.. We have determined that the correct bearing should be S. 67°20' W. and that this should be used in the computation of coordinates.

T. 2 S., R. 4 W. W. ½ mile bet. secs. 12 & 13 - plat reflects a bearing of N. 89°54' E., FNs show S. 89°54' E., which is incorrect.

T. 4 S., R. 1 W. Possible mismarked cor. S. ¼ cor. sec. 33. T. 4 S., R. 1 W., was surveyed in 1868 by Peter W. Bell. The Tp. to the S., T. 5 S., R. 1 W., was surveyed in 1896 by Rhoades and Kimmel. In this survey, the closing of the sec. line between secs. 5 & 4 was found to be excessive, so a closing cor. was set. This causes the cors. bet. sec. 33, T. 4 S., R. 1 W., and sec. 4, T. 5 S., R. 1 W., to be offset cors. A 1978 survey found the stone for which would now be the S. ¼ cor. of sec. 33, T. 4 S., R. 1 W. A brass cap was set and marked as the ¼ cor. common to sec. 33, T. 4 S., R. 1 W., and sec. 4, T. 5 S., R. 1 W.