

either. However, it is very evident that this monument was used as the point of beginning for a number of deed descriptions of properties adjacent to Cedar Street. I have measured into several lines of occupation on the East side of Cedar Street and they fit within a foot of the deed calls when you measure from this sixteenth corner monument. Using what is reported as the "true" corner position since 1970, these fences are all around 30 feet, plus or minus 5 feet, out of position. It is fairly evident that procedural errors were made in the past (some very minor, others with a greater impact) and it is also evident that property rights were established based upon the results of those errors that should not be extinguished.

And all the East-West fences as shown on Map of Survey No. 9-40-394 which translate into lines of occupation within the SW1/4SE1/4 of Section 9 except for the recent subdivisions (Eagle View Estates & Monta Vista) match very closely to deeds when using the Philo quarter corner for the sectional breakdown. There is a problem with the North-South fences due to the apparent 60 to 70 foot undersize of the section.

"City Survey of 1970" is a bit of a misnomer as it is only the survey of Section 16. It was expected, with a first glance at the title, it would include a majority of the City. It is Baker County Map of Survey No. 9-40-25BC. I know the intent of the survey was to resolve a problem that apparently existed in Section 16, but my observations indicate more were created than resolved. I do not understand the rationale for establishing the lost Northwest corner of Section 16 at the intersection of a projection line through the Northwest section corner and the North quarter corner of Section 17 and another projection line through the quarter corner and the North one-sixteenth corner between Sections 16 and 17. The resultant corner position is 1330.41 feet North of the sixteenth corner. Many of the early plats of subdivisions in Baker City are somewhat devoid of information about ties to section subdivision corners, but Mix's Addition appears to show the West quarter corner and the Northwest section corner of Section 16 as existing at the time the subdivision was surveyed. The distance shown between these corners by the Mix's Addition plat is 2640 feet. Whereas a sixteenth corner is to be at the midpoint between a section and quarter corner, a section corner should be reestablished at twice the distance between accepted quarter and sixteenth corners on the line projected by these corners, or approximately 10 feet South of the current monument location. The length of the blocks on surveys since 1970 are around 2.5 feet longer than plat distances of 250 feet. I don't believe the bearing-bearing method should have been used at this corner especially when the next corner discussed here was located by the distance-distance method as distances rank higher as accepted data in lost corner situations.

Another anomaly with Mix's Addition was the determination made on Survey No. 9-40-147BC in 1979 that Cedar Street was 80 feet wide along the East side of the Addition. The Deed Book "O" at Page 227 does show the 80 feet on a copy of the plat, but the official plat in the Plat Books is silent to the Cedar Street width. The taking of the additional 20 feet has caused the blocks between East and Cedar Streets to be shortened by approximately 5 foot each. The plat of Russell's Addition, which was laid over a portion of Mix's Addition that was not in the final recording due to ownership problems, has Cedar Street at a 60 foot width. Cedar Street is 60 feet wide in all locations except the two blocks adjacent to Mix's Addition. I believe far too much development has been done in Mix's Addition to correct much of any the described conditions, but hopefully this explanation will help future surveyors to understand the existing situation.

At the quarter corner between Sections 9 and 16 I just cannot accept the Jim Hanley