


# U.S. PUBLIC LAND SURVEY MONUMENT RECORD

For Public Land Survey Corners In: WI ADMINISTRATIVE CODE A-E 7.08 REQUIREMENT

T. 3 N. - R. 10 E. of the 4th P.M.

### CORNER CODE INDEX

(PLACE "◆" SYMBOL AT PROPER PLSS CORNER LOCATION)



MAGNOLIA TWP  
ROCK COUNTY WI

### COORDINATES

(GNSS DERIVED VIA WISCORS)

NORTHING: 281228.81    ELEV: N/A  
EASTING: 421790.49

Hor. Datum: WISCRS-ROCK, (NA2011)




Vertical Datum: NAVD 88, (If applicable)

**(a) LEGEND**

- - 3/4" x 24" REBAR SET W/RED CAP
- ⊙ - IRON PIPE FOUND
- (#) - PREVIOUS TIE-SHEET DIMENSION
- COTTON GIN SPINDLE SET IN PLACE OF A MASONRY NAIL FOUND WITH THE HEAD MISSING

#### LINE TABLE

LINE	BEARING	DISTANCE	
L1	N 49°30'00" W	55.68'	(55.65') & (55.68')
L2	S 67°56'26" E	16.59'	
L3	S 42°00'47" E	40.29'	



Field book: Magnolia 2013-14

Page: 68

Page 1 of 2

Corner code: N-17

**B) Describe any record evidence, monument evidence, occupational evidence, testimonial evidence or any other material evidence you considered, and whether the monument was found or placed.**

I found a masonry nail with the head broken off and one witness per the N-17 tie-sheet, (Barnes-2000). It appears that much construction/ditch maintenance, house removal, etc. has occurred since that time. The two southeasterly witnesses are disturbed but generally match the masonry nail found; the northwest pipe found matches a previous tie-distance that Barnes disagreed with by 0.03'. This masonry nail has been used to establish the North ¼ corner of Section 23, (Combs-2010), on tie-sheet N-19. I accept the masonry nail found given its apparent age, dimension to the northwest tie and proximity to those that are disturbed; additionally, it has been used to perpetuate other PLSS corners. In place of the broken nail, I set a cotton gin spindle and set four additional witnesses per the map.

**C) Was the corner restored through acceptance of (1) an obliterated evidence location, or, (2) a found perpetuated location?**

Found perpetuated location.

**D) Describe any material discrepancy between the location of the corner as restored or reestablished and the location of that corner as previously restored or reestablished by distance and direction. Show the discrepancy on the plan view drawing under (a), above. Show the distances between the corner as previously restored or reestablished and (1) the corner as restored or reestablished, and (2) to at least 4 of the witness monuments shown on the drawing in (a), above.**

I did not find a discrepancy between the corner restored and a previously documented corner location. *Discrepancy* being defined as *disagreeing* with a corner location, *not* as noting dimensional differences between current/former tie sheets due to measuring methods. The current and *most recent* tie-sheet dimensions filed for the corner are noted.

**(E) Was the corner reestablished through lost corner proportionate methods? If so, show the method, including the directions and distances to other public land survey corners used as evidence or used for proportioning the corner location.**

N/A

For reference, the dimension to the West ¼ corner of Section 23 matches a dimension Barnes shows in V. 6, Pg. 445 to 0.07 feet, (Houle 2661.00', Barnes 2660.93'). See the P-17 tie-sheet filed by Houle, (2014), for the West ¼ of Section 23.

I, **Jason R. Houle**, hereby certify that the corner location as identified by the corner code index was determined by me under my direction and control and that this U.S. Public Land Survey Monument Record is correct and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

**CORNER CODE: N-17**  
(A.E. 7.08 REQUIREMENT)

