



LL 318
11 12 11

June 23, 1960

C
O
P
Y
Y

Tom Patterson
Patterson Bros.
Minocqua, Wisconsin

Dear Tom:

I promised to send you the data we have on Sec. 36 - 40 - 3 E. around Pike and Turner lakes, so am enclosing letter from Bureau of Land Management and copy of plat showing data. As advised you this is only compass work with 2-chain tape, but it checks out very closely.

There seems to be no question but that the present center of the section must have been set at 40.00 ft. west of the N. 1/4 corner on about a due west course, as you will note a line drawn from a point on the north line 40.00 west of NE corner passes through this center as plotted. Also, the distance computes 39.99 using our measurements. 40.04

While undoubtedly parcels sold off years ago based on this survey will have to remain as is, there is a question as to whether it should be used on any future work. I would feel the correct center location should be used in any new sub-dividing, but perhaps our work should be checked somewhat. Will be glad to have your views on this.

Very truly yours,

Ivan Brantham

M/ch

2.56 from c w 11 P,
to Nw 1/4 coris
383 (Henry)
169
2.56
66
1336
15
114' d 74

LL 318
11 12 11

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT BY THE AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Washington, D. C.

April 22, 1959

Mr. Ivan Braham
Braham Woodland Products, Inc.
Eagle River, Wisconsin

April 22, 1959

Dear Mr. Braham:

In reply to your Inquiry general 20, relating to the resurvey of the line between sec. 25 and sec. 36 in Turner Lake, Wisconsin, there are three possible methods by which the surveys affecting Turner Lake may be considered. Two of these methods are shown upon the attached diagram sheet.

Method No. 1 is a straight proportion between the cor. of secs. 25, 30, 31 and 36 in Turner Lake and the N. C. on W. shore of Pike Lake. It is readily seen that this method may not afford too much protection to persons owning lands on the W. shore of Turner Lake. The distance between the N. C. of sec. 26 and the N. C. of sec. 36 would fall slightly less than one-half mile from the shore and the survey line would run at a great distance from the evidence found on the lake shore.

Method No. 2 accepts the present N. C. of Turner Lake as being the best available evidence of the original section line. It would then run the line between the N. C. of sec. 25 and the N. C. of sec. 36 in such a manner that the proportion between the distance from the N. C. of sec. 25 to the N. C. of sec. 36 and the distance from the N. C. of sec. 26 to the N. C. of sec. 36 would be approximately the same as the distance from the N. C. of sec. 25 to the N. C. of sec. 36 and the distance from the N. C. of sec. 26 to the N. C. of sec. 36. This would result in a line which would be approximately one-half mile from the W. shore of Turner Lake.

A third method would be to run the line parallel to the E. bdy. of sec. 36. This would be a very undesirable procedure, as it would run across the lake front, where such would be extremely difficult to survey. Additional lines would then be run from the section boundaries to the developed points on the lake. This may be what has happened in other cases where the lake near the center of the section.

The consideration of running the N. C. section line parallel to the E. bdy. of sec. 36 does not appear to be logical. It would either miss the W. shore of Turner Lake or run into it so little that owners on the shore would be deprived of any considered rights.

The above considered methods are advisory only and must be coordinated with State law and decisions rendered on this case.

Sincerely yours,

Merville H. Shearer
Chief, Industrial Engineering Section

April 22, 1959

Mr. John Shearer
Division of Forest Products, Inc.
Ridge River, Wisconsin

April 22, 1959

Dear Mr. Shearer:
Division of Land Management

Re: Survey of the line between sec. 25 and 30, Twp. 20, R. 10 E., W. of Hwy. 77, 40° N.; E. 1/4 sec. 30, Twp. 20, R. 10 E., W. of Hwy. 77, 40° N., Wisconsin, there are three possible methods which may be considered. Two of these are shown upon the attached sketch.

Method No. 1 is a straight line between the corners of secs. 25, 30, 31 and 32. Turner Lake, WI, suggests that the proper location of the 1/4 corner that our method may not be correct. In addition, the survey of the 1/4 corner of sec. 30, Twp. 20, R. 10 E., W. of Hwy. 77, 40° N., was taken on January 23, 1959, and no evidence was found in checking this past winter.

There may be some difficulty in regard to running the line through the lake, but it would be better than the other methods.

Method No. 2 is a line which may be improperly placed. It would run from the N. shore of the lake to the S. shore, then turn E. and run along the S. shore of the lake to the N. shore. This would be approximately 1/4 mile longer than the first method. It would be considered as being a better location of the 1/4 corner. It would also be more difficult to run the survey on account of the lake. This would happen at the instance of the white post which you show near the center of the section.

The consideration of running the line eastward parallel to the E. bdy. of sec. 30 does not appear to be logical. It would either miss the W. shore of Turner Lake or cut into sec. 31 so little that enough of the shore would be deprived of any considered area.

III/b

The above considered methods are advisory only and must be coordinated with State and Local authorities concerned.

Very truly yours,

Howard M. Shaeffer
Chief, Boundary Engineering Section

Sincerely yours,

Howard M. Shaeffer
Chief, Boundary Engineering Section

