The improper description is seen in each parcel with the assumption of a true and full quarter section of 160 Acres with 2640 feet, or 160 Rods, on each side. It will be particularly noted on Parcel #6 plus the 1 Acre square in the following manner: There being 160.693 Acres in said Southeast ¼, reflecting a "long" quarter; However it is not uniformly "long" or on all sides, the East side being found to be somewhat short.

The North and South sides varying only -.118 ft. $(l\frac{1}{2}")$ across said $\frac{1}{4}$ section and has little or no significance in maintaining the same equitable split as originally intended or as later with the l Acre trade taken into account.

The East and West sides varying 12.21 ft., it becomes necessary to deviate from a nominal "6" way split to an actual "6" way split, and thereby eliminating, as an example, the North 26 2/3 Acres, or the North 53 1/3 Acres as survey descriptions, with lines parallel with the North line of the Southeast \frac{1}{4}. In reproducing the intent of the original split, it is our opinion that each parcelwould now require its individual metes and bounds description reflecting the above facts and criteria.

William H. Klassen