



that would not necessarily hold for all corners on the west boundary since it could have been a localized situation developed in getting around the narrows, and of Bear Lake.

It may then be theorized that Riedon's resurvey of the west boundary, above the southeast corner and commencing at some unknown point on this line, was approximately 15 chains east of the original survey and the reestablished corner points at approximately 17 chains south of the original corners.

None of these deductions are intended to discredit or overthrow the Riedon Resurveys for the corners and lines as reestablished by him are the officially recognized positions by which the affected lands were patented.

However, in so far as the Riedon resurvey of the west boundary of T. 29 N., R. 14 W., is concerned, and actually this survey is recorded as the resurvey of the east boundary of T. 29 N., R. 15 W., the influence cannot be carried farther west than the range line and the corners so reestablished thereon.

In plotting the Sibley-Hedgen meander line of Lake Michigan in T. 29 N., R. 15 W., the near resemblance between this record position and the present shore is unappreciable, when the record position is adjusted to the heretofore described probable position of the range line. No appreciable discrepancies are discernible such as would lead to the conclusion that Sibley and Hedgen erroneously or fraudulently measured the shore. In fact, the similarity between the two lines is great enough to warrant the consideration of the original meander line standing upon its own record for the reestablishment of the original meander corners set on Lake Michigan. This of course would create some rather heavy bearings and excess measurements in the section lines of T. 29 N., R. 15 W., running from the east boundary of the township to the meander corners developed by this method. The method however is more equitable to the reestablishment of the subdivisional lines of T. 29 N., R. 15 W., than their projection westward from the range line to record positions and the creation of a presumed omitted area.

It is therefore the conclusion of this office, based upon the presented facts and the study of the record of the involved surveys, that the original survey of T. 29 N., R. 15 W., was well and faithfully executed to the exclusion of any consideration that any appreciable area within that township was omitted, which area might be held to be



UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

5,04 b

Mr. Charles E. Miller  
Chief, Lands Division  
Department of Conservation  
Lansing 26, Michigan

My dear Mr. Millars:

RECEIVED  
APR 11 1955  
APR

Further reference is made to your letter of February 23, and your reply of March 31 in answer to our letter of March 23, relating to the public land survey situation in the Sleeping Bear State Park, Twp. 29 N., R. 14 W. and 15 W., Michigan Meridian. The situation has been further reviewed and studied with the following considerations and conclusions.

In the resurvey of T. 29 N., R. 14 W., as executed by Orange Rison, Deputy Surveyor, in 1850, it appears that the resurvey of the west boundary and such of the subdivisional work was virtually independent of the original work by Deputy Surveyors Sibley and Hodgson. Rison records the recovery of the meander corner of sec. 32 on the westerly shore of Bear Lake and the corner of secs. 31 and 32, both on the south boundary of the township, which he adopted. He also recovered the 1/4 sec. cor. of sec. 31 and the SW corner of the township which he apparently only used for alignment of the south boundary, since he reestablished new corners for these points. He then proceeded to reestablish the west boundary of T. 29 N., R. 14 W. in a true north direction, establishing corners at 40 and 80 chains, without further reference to the original work.

It is to be noted that both the original Deputies and Rison encountered difficulty at the northwest end of Bear Lake in running the lines between secs. 29 and 31 and secs. 30 and 31. In Rison's reestablishment of the 5th meridional line, he does not record the recovery of any corners thereon between Bear Lake and Lake Michigan. When Rison strikes Lake Michigan on this line, his position is considerably east of the northeasterly angle of the point of land. The Sibley-Hodgson line strikes the shore at a considerable distance west of this angle; there being approximately 15 chains difference in the two lines on the Lake Michigan Shore. This leads to the thought that the range line as originally surveyed north out of the township corner might have been some 15 chains west of Rison's resurvey.

The development of a latitudinal displacement of the south boundary of approximately 17 chains, as noted by Rison, is a condition