

The creek calls to the east are in a wide bottom where the creek has wandered in many locations, so trying to tell where it was of at the time of the original survey is impossible. There are now more crossings than called for in the original survey which indicates it has wandered.

The creek has changed channels at the first call west of Thompson's one quarter since the corner was restored in 1965.

I believe that Paul L. Thompson saw some evidence of the original survey when he restored the corner in the early 1950's. He was a competent land surveyor of good reputation. It is unfortunate that he didn't record his restoration of this one quarter corner. The State also restored the one quarter corner between Sections 34 and 35 at the same position Paul Thompson restored it earlier and hadn't recorded. Foestes accepted this position.

I also disagree with Foestes three line trees to the west of his one quarter. Jim Russell looked for all of these line trees when he did his survey in 1965 with negative results. Foestes hasn't proven that any of these are the original line trees, he is only guessing. His only argument is their relation to corners and topography. Other of his found line trees on this plat disagree with the original distances from corners up to .50 feet. I contend that there are and could have been many other trees in or near these areas that would also fit as close as the ones Foestes chose, but without proof they shouldn't be used.

The State Forestry Department does not accept Foeste's corner position and therefore, doesn't accept his plat of Section 34 as a valid Section subdivision.

DM:kw
3242D

