

## Anton Chico Land Grant

This grant seems to have experienced relatively little controversy over the boundary locations, with an exception of the dispute associated with the Preston Beck claim, in comparison to grants which have been dramatically reduced from the size of the original claim.

The mapping project has compared three versions of the boundary: the 1860 survey, the 1878 survey (intended as a resurvey of the same basic boundaries of the 1860 version) and the current BLM shapefile, which closely reflects the other two.

These versions seem to be consistent with the verbal descriptions:

*"On the north, the boundary of Don Antonio Ortiz; on the south, the ridge of the Piedra Pintada and the little (tablo?) land of Guadalupe; on the east, the Salino Spring with the Alto de los Esteros; where the river forms a canon below, where the men were killed, and on the west, the Cuesta and this little Bernal hill which is the boundary of El Bado..."* ("Letter by Manuel Baca and Jose Miguel Sanchez, May 2, 1822," Spanish Archives of New Mexico I (SANM-I), Reel 16c.2, Fr. 521, Center for Southwest Research, University Libraries, University of New Mexico.)

*"On the north, by the Antonio Ortiz Grant; on the east, by the Salino Spring, with the Alto de los Esteros, where the river forms a canyon below where the men were killed; on the south, by the ridge of Piedra Pintada and the little table land of Guadalupe; and on the west, by the Cuesta and Bernal Hill which is the boundary of San Miguel del Vado Grant."* (Bowden, J.J. "Anton Chico Grant." *New Mexico Office of the State Historian*. New Mexico State Record Center and Archives. Web. 24 Mar. 2011. <[http://www.newmexicohistory.org/filedetails\\_docs.php?fileID=24814](http://www.newmexicohistory.org/filedetails_docs.php?fileID=24814)>.)

Of the physical features mentioned, I have identified the following to be (approximately) consistent with the understood patent boundaries of the grant in the three versions:

- Salino Spring
- Piedra Pintada
- Bernal Hill

Similarly, it is my interpretation (based on elevation maps and other data) that the following features are also consistent:

- Alto de los Esteros
- Antonio Ortiz Grant
- Table land of Guadalupe

I was unable to identify the Cuesta feature, but assume that it is represented by the southwestern boundary, as all of the other features appear to match up. More research needs to be done in order to resolve the uncertainties associated with the consistency of the various surveys with the boundary

markers mentioned in the verbal descriptions. This is something best done by review of USGS topographic maps (found at topoquest.com) and discussion with people who are familiar with the history and geography of the area – the GIS information resources herein have already been used to their full potential.

### Comparisons

Measurement of the current patent parcel (including the Preston Beck Grant), shows the current one to be about 2,331ac smaller than the described 378,537.5ac (simply comparing the BLM version to the claim on which it is based). This is likely due to inaccuracies associated with the 1878 survey, which were rectified later. Projection of the 1878 survey points and polygon construction shows the area to be about 384,940ac - 99.33% of the claimed area. Shape of the projection is consistent, although boundaries extend farther than the current ones in the eastern and southern portions of the grant, likely due to differences in measurement methods with respect to topography, which is somewhat irregular here. The directionality of the boundary segments appears consistent between the two versions, suggesting that the hilly terrain has induced simple differences in the record of distance. It is noted that the 1878 projection does not actually meet the "Salino Spring" landmark on a turning point of the eastern boundary, whereas the current BLM version directly intersects it. Features along the southern boundary (i.e. Table land of Guadalupe) are not spatially discrete (a mesa), overlain in different places by the boundaries, such that it would be impossible to say that one version is correct or not.

The 1860 survey plat has also been projected, in order to analyze the possible reason for which it was rejected and resurveyed (allegedly because the polygon did not close). The boundary of this projection is, in areas, farther from the BLM version than the 1870 version, and in other areas, closer to it. It is certainly closer in along the northern and northeastern boundary, about equal along the western boundary, and about 2x as far away from the BLM version as the 1878 projection in the southeastern and southern portions. The area of the 1860 projection is estimated by ArcGIS to be 396,432ac – this is approximately 6,770ac more than the survey plat estimates – a difference of 1.7%. It is logical that this survey would be reconsidered, as the 1878 one seems about 2x as accurate.

There seems to be no major difference between the different versions of the boundary, and I have found no evidence indicating that there was a historic boundary that differs greatly from these interpretations.



# **Anton Chico Local Issues/Concerns**

## **Legislative Land Grant Committee**

**08/23/12**

### **Issue:**

### **USFS:**

- \*ACLG Member preference after current leases terminate**

### **Taxes:**

- \* Grazing rate for all non residential or commercial land**

### **Water for Livestock:**

- \*Stockponds for Cattle**
- \*Unused Community Wells**

### **Wastewater System:**

- \*Regional Mutual Domestic in place**
- \*Regional Wastewater- next!**

### **Local (County) Representation:**

- \*Curently not true districting**