



DETAILS

NO SCALE

NOTES

1. Basis of Bearings. Bearing West for E. half of N. line of Sec. 35, between two confirmed original corners, as shown on G.L.O. Township Plat approved Oct. 4, 1876.
2. SW corner of Sec. 35 was a lost corner with no nearby evidence for restoration. Replacement by single proportion east and west on township line not feasible as nearest recovered confirmable corner is four miles west at township corner. Gross inconsistencies in the original notes of the township line as to terrain indicate that part of township line was probably not surveyed. SW corner of Sec. 35 established by projection, running west from SE Cor. of Sec. 35 and south from NW Cor. of Sec. 35 to an intersection. A comparison of these lines thus run with terrain features in original G.L.O. notes indicates that this method provides the best restoration of SW cor. of Sec. 35 possible under the circumstances.
3. W  $\frac{1}{4}$  Sec. Cor and S  $\frac{1}{4}$  Sec. Cor of Sec. 35 lost, restored by single proportion.
4. Two stumps accepted as original bearing trees for E  $\frac{1}{4}$  Sec. Cor. of Sec. 35, as per detail hereon. Due to an apparent error in one, or both, bearings to bearing trees ties do not intersect. Distances to bearing trees checked fairly close. No other trees, stumps or stump holes in vicinity fit original ties even approximately.  $\frac{1}{4}$  Sec. Cor. thus restored coincides with terrain features in original notes very well.
5. S  $\frac{1}{4}$  Sec. Cor of Sec. 2 lost, restored by single proportion.
6. E  $\frac{1}{4}$  Sec. Cor of Sec. 2 set 2640 ft. northerly along Sec. line from SE Sec. Cor. as per B.L.M. Survey Manual. ( see Note 8 )
7. The record description of the boundary between Plumas and Sierra Counties in relation to available maps indicates that said boundary lies approximately along, or a short distance north of, the south line of Sec. 2 as shown hereon. No evidence was recovered on the ground indicating the location of said boundary.
8. A study of the original notes for the survey of Sec. 2 hereon, along with a thorough investigation of all evidence on the ground, indicates that in all probability the north half of Sec. 2 was not run out on the original survey. A call in the original notes for a small gulch bearing NE $\frac{1}{4}$ ly at 37.90 chains north of the SE corner of Sec. 2 which approximately agrees with the terrain indicates a strong probability that the south half of the east line of Sec. 2 was actually run out and the E.  $\frac{1}{4}$  Sec. Cor. set a location with an approximate northing of 40 chains (2640 ft.) from the SE Sec. cor. In view of the above, and to avoid any possible encroachment upon lands of Hi Valley, Inc. and upon lands of U.S. Forest Service in the event of a resurvey of Sec. 2, standard distances were used for the S $\frac{1}{4}$  and the S $\frac{3}{4}$  of the east line of Sec. 2, rather than proration of said east line into concordant parts.

RECORD OF SURVEY  
SEC. 2, T21N, R12E. AND SEC 35, T22N, R12E., M.D.M.