

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Mining properties in Oregon that were involved in the DMA,  
DMEA, or OME Mineral Exploration Programs, 1950-1974

By

Thor H. Kiilsgaard<sup>1</sup>

Open File Report 98-464

This report is preliminary and has not been reviewed for conformity with U.S. Geological Survey editorial standards or with the North American Stratigraphic Code. Any use of trade, product, or firm names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

1998

<sup>1</sup>Spokane, Washington, 99201-1087

CONTENTS

**INTRODUCTION ..... 1**

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PROGRAMS ..... 2

DEFENSE MINERALS ADMINISTRATION (DMA) PROGRAM ..... 2

DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION (DMEA) PROGRAM ..... 4

**MINERAL EXPLORATION UNDER PUBLIC LAW 85-701 ..... 5**

OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION (OME) PROGRAM ..... 6

**FILING PRACTICES FOR DMA, DMEA, AND OME DATA ..... 6**

**INFORMATION COMPILED UNDER THE DMA, DMEA, OR OME PROGRAMS ..... 7**

FIELD TEAM APPLICATION REPORT ..... 8

EXPLORATION CONTRACT..... 9

***Exploration contract operator’s reports..... 9***

Monthly progress report..... 9

Final report..... 9

***Field Team reports..... 10***

Interim report..... 10

Final report..... 10

**MINERAL EXPLORATION IN OREGON ..... 11**

**LOCATION OF COMPILED DMA, DMEA, AND OME DATA..... 13**

ILLUSTRATION AND TABLE

**PLATE 1. MAP SHOWING LOCATION OF MINING PROPERTIES IN OREGON THAT WERE INVOLVED IN THE DMA, DMEA, OR OME MINERAL EXPLORATION PROGRAMS.**

**(PLATE NOT AVAILABLE IN A DIGITAL FORMAT)**

**TABLE 1. MINING PROPERTIES IN OREGON THAT WERE INVOLVED IN THE DMA, DMEA, OR OME MINERAL EXPLORATION PROGRAMS.....14**

Mining Properties in Oregon that were involved in DMA,  
DMEA, or OME Mineral Exploration Programs, 1950-1974

By  
Thor H. Kiilsgaard<sup>1</sup>

## Introduction

This report and accompanying map (Plate 1) presents information on the Defense Minerals Administration (DMA), Defense Minerals Exploration Administration (DMEA), and Office of Minerals Exploration (OME) mineral exploration programs in Oregon. Under these programs, the federal government participated in the exploration costs for certain strategic and critical minerals. Federal funds for mineral exploration under the programs were available from 1950 to 1974, although limited funds for OME administrative work were continued until 1979.

The report reviews the three programs, associated regulations, administrative procedures, and operational techniques. It also describes the various types of informative reports on individual mining properties generated by the programs, lists properties in Oregon that were involved in the different exploration programs, and advises on the location of compiled information that resulted from the work.

-----  
<sup>1</sup>U.S. Geological Survey  
904 W. Riverside  
Spokane, Washington

## ***Defense Production Act programs***

The Defense Production Act of 1950 (Public Law 774, 81st Congress) provided financial assistance to private enterprise for the production of goods and services necessary for national security. Title III, Section 302 of the Defense Production Act, provided for encouragement of exploration, development, and mining of critical and strategic metals and minerals. Under provisions of the Act, the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, established the Defense Minerals Administration, within the department, by a Secretarial Order dated December 4, 1950. Along with other duties, the Defense Minerals Administration was to serve as a direct contracting agency for minerals exploration.

### ***Defense Minerals Administration (DMA) program***

The DMA program was administered at national headquarters, Department of the Interior building, Washington DC, by a small group of senior mining engineers and geologists, recruited from the minerals industry. These administrative men were widely experienced in mineral exploration and mine development.

The headquarters group developed guidelines, and administrative procedures for the government-supported DMA minerals exploration program. They prepared pamphlets that described the DMA program, identified minerals classified as strategic and critical, and advised on the percentages of exploration costs the government would pay on exploration for the minerals. They developed application forms for use in seeking federal financial assistance, and contract forms for those cases where an application was approved and a mineral exploration contract was negotiated between the applicant and the federal government.

DMA administrative officials relied on Field Teams composed of U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) geologists and U.S. Bureau of Mines (USBM) engineers for all field work. The United States was divided into regions, with different USGS-USBM Field Teams responsible for field investigations in the different regions. Regional headquarters for Field Team work in Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington was the U.S. Geological Survey Field Office in Spokane, Washington.

The initial step of an applicant seeking Federal financial aid in mineral exploration was submittal of an application. The

application required description of the real property to be involved, a description of the proposed exploration work, and an estimate of expected costs. Information on geologic features of the property to be explored also was required, along with identification of the strategic mineral or minerals being sought, and reasons for expecting the proposed work to result in a significant discovery. Also required were maps or illustrations of the prospective property that showed location of the proposed work with respect to property boundaries, and to existing mine workings, if any. Many applications contained supporting, unpublished geologic or engineering reports. These reports commonly contained maps or illustrations that showed location of known mineralized bodies, estimates of the metal content of the known bodies, based on sample analysis, projected or inferred parts of the mineralized body or bodies that warranted further exploration, and other descriptive information.

Upon receipt of an application, DMA officials usually requested that a field examination of the proposed exploration site be made by the appropriate USGS-USBM Field Team, and that a report covering the field examination be submitted to DMA headquarters. If the field team application examination report indicated that proposed exploratory work might result in a significant discovery, if ownership or title to the prospective property was clear, and if the proposed work appeared to be a reasonable way of exploring the deposit, DMA usually entered into an exploration contract with the applicant, who, thereafter, was identified as the contract operator. The exploration contract specified work to be done, set a time frame in which the work was to be completed, estimated the total exploration costs of the project, and established the amount of estimated costs to be paid by the government. Other pertinent data also were included in the contract.

The exploration contract obligated the contract operator to certain responsibilities. These included submittal of monthly progress reports, which were used by DMA officials to justify payment of the government's share of exploration costs for work completed during the reporting period. A final report was required upon completion of the exploration project. This report was supposed to cover all aspects of the exploration project, including accomplishments, costs, and findings. In the event that ore was mined and sold from the obligated property, during the time the exploration contract was in force, the contract operator was

obligated to repay the government for its share of the exploration costs at a fixed percentage of funds derived from ore sold during the reporting interval. In those instances where a significant discovery was made by the exploration work and DMA officials decided the exploration project had been successful, a Certificate of Possible Production was issued to the contract operator. The certificate specified royalty that was to be paid to the government on mineral production from the obligated property. The obligated royalty rate varied according to terms of the Certificate of Possible Production but commonly was 5 percent of the net smelter returns on processed ore. The obligating certificate pertained to mine production from the property for a specified period of time, commonly for 10 years from the date of the contract, or until the government's share of exploration costs was repaid, whichever occurred first. If no discovery was made, repayment was not required and the contract operator was notified that the government had no lien on the obligated property. The contract operator was not obligated to mine ore found by contract work, nor was the government obligated to purchase mineralized material found by the exploration work.

DMA was a short-lived program that was terminated on November 20, 1951.

### ***Defense Minerals Exploration Administration (DMEA) program***

The previously described DMA program was concerned with aspects of the minerals field other than mineral exploration. These other aspects included, serving as a claimant agency for materials and facilities and as an advisory agency responsible for a minerals supply expansion program. It also was concerned with an allocation program for ores and concentrates in short supply. The various aspects, other than mineral exploration, were transferred to the Defense Materials Procurement Agency (DMPA), General Services Administration, on November 20, 1951. As a means of continuing the mineral exploration program started under DMA, the Secretary of the Department of the Interior established the DMEA program within the department, effective November 20, 1951.

The DMEA program was confined to exploration for critical and strategic minerals and was administrated by the same personnel who had formerly administered the DMA program. It operated from the same national headquarters site. DMEA program officials were

responsible for processing all exploration applications received under the previous DMA program and for administrative work involved in completion of exploration contracts started under the DMA program. Some applications for exploration assistance, submitted under the DMA program, subsequently were executed as DMEA contracts. DMEA officials also issued Certificates of Possible Production to DMA contract operators, if, in the opinion of the administrative officials, mine production was likely to result from a successful exploration project. In rare instances DMEA officials issued a royalty obligation that was similar to a Certificate of Possible Production but which concerned a property on which no significant discovery had been made. A typical instance for such an obligation was where exploration work gave good indications of a possible mineral discovery, which would benefit the obligated property, but where the scheduled exploration was terminated by the contract operator short of completion of work specified in the contract. The DMEA program utilized the same USGS-USBM Field Team arrangement, and operated more or less under the same regulations, practices, and procedures established by DMA. It was a much more extensive program than DMA and continued until 1958, when it was terminated.

## **Mineral Exploration under Public Law 85-701**

Government-supported mineral exploration under the Defense Production Act of 1950 was not considered justifiable in 1958, as defense needs of mineral supplies were considered to have been met. It was recognized, however, that there continued to be a need for mineral raw materials to meet the expanding national economy. To meet this need, Congress, on August 21, 1958, enacted Public Law 85-701, under which governmental financial assistance, on a participating basis, was available to private industry for stimulation of exploration for such raw materials as might be designated by the Secretary of the Department of the Interior. Under this law, the Secretary of the Department of the Interior established the Office of Minerals Exploration program on September 11, 1958.

## ***Office of Minerals Exploration (OME) program***

The OME program was similar to the previous DMA and DMEA programs but more restrictive. It was operated under the same Department of the Interior administrative offices and utilized the same USGS-USBM Field Team arrangement as had the previous DMA and DMEA programs. It adhered, more or less, to practices, regulations and procedures that had been established under the two preceding programs. One change in the OME program was allowance of participating funds for the exploration of certain minerals and metals, including gold and silver, that had not been eligible under the two previous programs. Funds for the government-supported mineral exploration program came from annual appropriations to the Department of the Interior.

To economize on costs, all administrative and operating responsibilities of the OME program were transferred to the U.S. Geological Survey in 1965. Thereafter, all field functions previously handled by the USGS-USBM Field Team, were performed by USGS personnel. Funds allocated to the USGS for participation in OME mineral exploration projects were terminated in 1974, although limited administrative funds continued to be received by the USGS until 1979. These administrative funds covered costs of such work as closing out existing exploration contracts, preparation of final reports on completed contracts, and continued review and audit of royalty funds received from the sale of ore mined from deposits that had been discovered by the government-supported exploration projects, and subsequently covered by a Certificate of Possible Production, or which, by contract amendment, were obligated to royalty payment. A change in regulations concerning acquisition of federal assistance in financing exploration for mineral reserves in the United States, its territories and possessions became effective on January 19, 1993 (Federal Register, vol. 57, no. 243, December 17, 1992). The change in regulations terminated the OME program.

## **Filing practices for DMA, DMEA, and OME data**

Applications for financial assistance in mineral exploration were sent either directly to National Headquarters, Department of the Interior, Washington DC, or else to the USGS-USBM Field Team headquarters of the region in which the property to be explored was located. Applications received at a Field Team headquarters were

forwarded to the National Headquarters in Washington DC. At National Headquarters, applications were filed under individual docket numbers that subsequently were used by both National Headquarters and the Field Team as a means of cataloguing and identifying correspondence and documents related to the particular application or to a resulting exploration contract. The national headquarters file, in effect, became the master file for all compiled information resulting from the application. Copies of compiled information on applications and on exploration contracts that resulted from the applications also commonly were filed at the Field Team headquarters office in the region where the concerned properties were located. For applications that concerned properties in Oregon, the Field Team regional headquarters was at the USGS field office in Spokane, Washington.

After 1965, when OME activities were consolidated under the USGS, OME applications were sent either to the OME office of the USGS in Washington DC, or to regional field offices of the USGS in Knoxville, Tennessee, Denver, Colorado, Menlo Park, California, or Spokane, Washington, depending on the location of the applicant's property.

## **Information compiled under the DMA, DMEA, or OME programs**

A variety of technical information was generated by the DMA, DMEA, and OME programs. Property and proposed work descriptions, together with geologic and analytical information on the target to be explored, were submitted with the initial application. Such information commonly was accompanied by unpublished supporting technical reports or production records on the property. Operators of active exploration contracts were obligated by contract terms to submit monthly progress reports that described work that had been completed. Exploration contracts also obligated contract operators to submit final reports on completed projects. These final reports described exploration work that was done, costs, problems, and findings. The USGS-USBM Field Team wrote application reports that covered initial field investigation of the proposed exploration project, interim reports that covered field investigations of active exploration contracts, and final reports that covered accomplishments and findings of completed contracts. After administrative responsibilities for the OME program were

transmitted to the USGS in 1965, all reports formerly written by the USGS-USBM Field Team were written by the USGS personnel.

### ***Field team application report***

Applications for mineral exploration financial assistance on properties in Oregon, once received at National Headquarters, Department of the Interior, Washington DC, were transmitted to the regional USGS office in Spokane, with the request that a Field Team examination be made of the applicant's property and proposed exploration project, and that an application report on the examination be prepared and submitted to the National Headquarters office. The Field Team application report investigated all factors concerned with the applicant's proposal. Principal attention was given to the geology of the exploration target and to whether the proposed work had a reasonable chance of resulting in a significant discovery. The applicant's maps, illustrative material, and reports were examined at the proposed project site. If the maps were found to be inadequate, new maps or other illustrative material were prepared by the Field Team. Samples of mineralized structures were taken and assayed to check sample values reported by the applicant. The location of proposed work, with respect to existing mine workings and to mining claim or property boundaries was examined as were documents pertaining to the applicants rights to the prospective property. The type of proposed exploration work, estimated costs, time schedule of proposed work, equipment to be used, and operating experience of the applicant or the applicant's supervisor or representative were considered. The proposed work was carefully studied to see if it presented the most logical way of exploring the mineralized target. Modifications to the proposed work often were discussed with the applicant and commonly were adopted.

The Field Team application report, in effect, evaluated the applicant's proposal and the geologic probability of the proposed work resulting in a significant discovery. It provided a basis for the national headquarters decision on whether to approve or deny an application. For applications that subsequently were denied, the application report commonly represented the best-documented source of geologic information on the concerned property.

## ***Exploration contract***

An approved application usually resulted in an exploration contract between the federal government and the applicant. The contract was designed to do the work proposed in the application, or that of a modified exploration plan approved jointly by the applicant and government officials. Under the contract, the government agreed to participate in the costs of completed work on a prorated basis and for a fixed amount. The percentage of exploration costs to be paid by the government depended on the principal metal to be explored. For example, the government paid 90 percent of the exploration costs at a uranium deposit but only 50 percent of the costs at a copper deposit. The contract obligated the contract operator to prepare and submit certain reports. The Field Team also prepared reports that dealt with the exploratory work done by the contract operator.

### **Exploration contract operator's reports**

#### Monthly progress report

An exploration contract obligated the contract operator to submit a monthly progress report that described exploration work accomplished and costs that had been incurred during the reporting period. Payment to the operator, for the government's share of exploration costs incurred during the reporting period, was based on the monthly progress reports, which usually were brief and factual. Occasionally, the operator would request an amendment to the contract and would use the monthly progress report to justify the request. For example, the exploration work might have uncovered evidence that indicated proposed work in the target area should be changed, in which case the contract operator would use the monthly progress report, along with accompanying maps or geologic illustrations to justify a requested contract amendment. In such instances, the monthly progress report might constitute the only documented information used to validate an amended change in the exploration project.

#### Final report

An exploration contract stipulated that the contract operator submit a final report upon completion of contract work. This report reviewed exploration accomplishments, problems encountered,

findings, and costs. It usually contained maps and geologic sketches to illustrate what had been done and found. In instances where a significant mineral discovery was made, the report commonly presented estimates of the tonnage and grade of ore reserves found. Final reports on unsuccessful contracts usually were brief and non-informative.

## **Field Team reports**

### Interim report

Interim reports by the USGS-USBM Field Team, and, after 1965, by the USGS, were based on routine field investigations of a property being explored under an exploration contract. The principal purpose of these investigations was to see that exploration work was being done in conformance to contract specifications. Some interim reports, particularly those that described amended changes in contract specifications, often contained assay information and sketches of the geologic findings.

### Final report

A final report by the USGS-USBM Field Team, and, after 1965, by the USGS, described and summarized accomplishments of the exploration contract. The report reviewed the geologic setting of the deposit, geologic structures that controlled the ore body, the mineralogy, and alteration features of the deposit or associated wallrock. It presented information on tonnage and grade of discovered ore reserves, using the contract operator's data, where acceptable, otherwise it presented Field Team calculations, based on contract findings. A final report included maps, sample and assay data, and other supporting information. It discussed geologic guides to ore, where they had been determined, and described additional targets that warranted exploration, should the exploration work have identified such targets. Maps showing location of the completed work with respect to property boundaries were included. The report included a description of completed work, a summary of costs and a technical evaluation of the project. It recommended a Certification of Possible Production when appropriate, or noted the existence of an already declared royalty obligation, should one have been declared previously. Also discussed was whether the government should participate in the

funding of further exploration work at the property. The Field Team final report was comprehensive and contained most of the available compiled information on the explored deposit.

## **Mineral exploration in Oregon**

The location of mineralized properties in Oregon, for which applications for DMA, DMEA, or OME mineral exploration assistance were received, is shown on the enclosed map (Plate 1). Property locations are shown by county, in appropriate townships, and in approximate sections. Property names, geographic locations, and other identifying information are presented in Table 1, the information based largely on material available in USGS files at Spokane, Washington, prior to 1996. Applications that presented property location information that was too vague to be used and where a field examination of the applicants property was not made are not listed in Table 1 nor are the property locations shown on Plate 1.

Applications that did not result in exploration contracts are shown on the map by a set of open symbols that differ slightly from the partly filled symbols that mark the sites of properties that were explored under exploration contracts. Exploration contracts that resulted in significant mineral discoveries, and for which Certificates of Possible Production were issued, or which, because of contract amendment stipulated royalty obligations on ore mined from property delineated in the contract, are shown by similar shaped but solid symbols. All symbols are keyed to the exploration program under which the application was filed. A number near the property symbol on the map keys the property to Table 1.

Many property locations shown on the map are only approximate and are based on indefinite information.

Topographic maps of usable scale, and covering areas in Oregon in which many applicant properties were located, were not available when much of the government-supported exploration work was done. For properties in such areas, USGS-USBM Field Team members commonly used the applicant's description of the property location. Such location descriptions may have referred to a site as a certain distance from a town or from road or stream junctions. As these distances commonly were measured in miles, the map locations, in

terms of section, range, and township were indefinite. Accurate location descriptions in mountainous parts of the Cascade Range were especially difficult to obtain. Topographic maps of the USGS, and maps of the U.S. Forest Service maps, available in 1998, have helped in identification of property locations listed in Table 1 more accurately.

Table 1 lists the docket number under which all material pertaining to the exploration application was filed, the name of the applicant, the property or claim name, strategic and critical minerals of the property, and the location of the property by section, township and range. The map number shown on the right side of the table corresponds to the map number near the property location shown by symbol on the map (Plate 1).

Table 1 shows that more than one application was filed on many properties. In such instances, the property is identified on the map by the symbol and number applicable to the initial application, whether it was filed under the DMA, DMEA, or OME program. This is for map clarification, for more than one symbol or map number at the same site would be confusing. For properties on which more than one application was filed, Table 1 lists the docket numbers, information applicable to the successive applications, and, in the status column, shows the status attained by the application. For example, at such properties an application that was denied by the government or withdrawn by an applicant is shown in the status column as an Application, whereas an application that was approved and for which a contract was negotiated is shown as a Contract. Also, contracts under which a Certificate of Possible Production was issued, or which for other reasons obligated the property to repay the government for its share of funds spent on the exploration contract are shown in the status column as Certified Contracts.

Successive applications on a single property resulted from different reasons. The original application may have proposed an exploration plan that was not acceptable to the government and consequently was denied. The original application may have classified the property as a lead-zinc deposit, when production statistics and geological data showed the deposit to have been worked primarily for gold and silver, metals that did not qualify for federal financial assistance under the DMA and DMEA programs, but did under the OME program. An application on a property may

have been denied, but the property then came under control by different management, or under another organization, which subsequently filed a revised application on the property that may have led to an exploration contract. In another instance, exploration under a DMA, DMEA, or OME contract may have indicated another target on the same property that also warranted exploration. This determination could have resulted in a separate application and subsequent exploration contract.

## **Location of compiled DMA, DMEA, and OME data**

In 1998, compiled DMA, DMEA, and OME files, covering government-supported mineral exploration work done in the United States, were in archive storage at the USGS Field Office, Post Office Building, 904 W. Riverside, Spokane, Washington. Prior to 1996, the Spokane files of the USGS contained only information generated by the exploration programs in the states of Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon. By 1996, however, the National Headquarters master files, which previously had been stored at the National Records Center, Suitland, Maryland, had been transferred to the USGS field office at Spokane, Washington, as had USGS files on DMA, DMEA, and OME business that formerly had been stored at Denver, Colorado, or at Herndon, Virginia.

Information at the Spokane office, on properties involved in the DMA, DMEA, or OME programs, can be made available, upon request, provided the requesting person presents a letter from the former contract operator, the property owner, the legal holder of the property, or a representative authorized to act for owners of the property, which authorizes release of the information. With the letter of authorization on hand, reports, maps, or other requested information is sent to a private reproduction firm, where the requested material is reproduced at the expense of the requesting individual. The reproduced material is sent to the requesting individual and the original material is returned to the USGS storage file.

Table 1--Mining properties in Oregon that were involved in the DMA, DMEA, or OME mineral exploration programs

<u>Docket No.—Operator</u>	<u>Property—Commodity</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Map No. or Status</u>
<u>BAKER COUNTY</u>			
DMEA-2786 East Eagle Mining Co.	East Eagle mine (copper)	Sec. 32, T. 6 S., R. 44 E.	1
DMEA-3243 Jones, C. A.	Red Mound claim (copper)	Sec. 29, T. 6 S., R. 48 E.	2
DMA-1484 Arthur, John	Argonaut mine (lead-zinc-copper)	Sec. 19, T. 8 S., R. 37 E.	3
OME-6597 Ramsey, Ramsey, and Ramsey	Argonaut claims (gold-silver)	Sec. 19, T. 8 S., R. 37 E.	Cert. Contract
OME-6702 Omega Mines Ltd.	Bourne group (gold-silver)	Secs. 28, 29, and 32, T. 8 S., R. 37 E.	4
DMEA-4106 American Nickel Corp.	Nickel claims (nickel)	Secs. 22 and 23, T. 9 S., R. 36 E.	5
DMA-2081 Taylor, J. T.	Cliff Gold-Tungsten mine (tungsten)	Sec. 32, T. 8 S., R. 41 E.	6
DMA-322 Ingerson, G. H.	Lucky Strike (Antimony)	Secs. 18 and 19, T. 9 S., R. 41 E.	7
DMEA-2487 Trickel and Johnson	San Luis claims (antimony)	Sec. 32, T. 9 S., R. 42 E.	8
DMEA-3189 Ketell Mining Corp.	Jewell Black Manganese claims (manganese)	Secs. 12 and 13, T. 10 S, R. 41 E.	9
OME-6461 Pedro Mountain Mining Co.	Silver Queen prospect (Silver-gold)	Sec. 1, T. 13 S., R. 42 E.	10
DMA-2014 Thompson, Ivan	Nickel Domes 1 and 2 (nickel-asbestos)	Sec. 34, T. 13 S., R. 43 E.	11
<u>CLACKAMAS COUNTY</u>			
OME-6086 Bartell, A. O.	Nisbet mine (mercury)	Sec. 5, T. 6 S., R. 7 E.	12
<u>COOS COUNTY</u>			
OME-6149 Hays, H. E.	Galena property (gold-silver)	Sec. 27, T. 32 S., R. 12 W.	24

DMEA-3308 Royer, G. C.	North Bend-Myrtle Pt. (chromium)	Secs. 12 and 13, T. 33 S., R. 12 W.	25
---------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	----

CROOK COUNTY

DMEA-2628 Page, M.L. and Page C. J.	Strickland Butte mine (mercury)	Sec. 14, T. 13 S., R. 17 E.	13
DMEA-3499 Page, M.L. and Page, C. J.	Strickland Butte mine (mercury)	Sec. 14, T. 13 S., R. 17 E.	Application
DMEA-3537 Pigmon, Owen	Endicott mine (mercury)	Sec. 16, T. 14 S., R. 20 E.	14
DMEA-3938 Orion Expl. and Devel. Co.	Log Cabin claims (Amity mine) (mercury)	Secs. 16 and 21, T. 14 S., R. 20 E.	15
DMEA-4428 Bellows, C. R.	Mother Lode mine (mercury)	Secs. 20 and 29, T. 14 S., R. 20 E.	16
OME-6141 Pacific Minerals and Chemical Co.	Mother lode-Cobar group (mercury)	Secs. 19, 20, 29, and 30, T. 14 S., R. 20 E.	17
OME-6456 Taylor, C. F.	Maury Mountain mine mercury)	Secs. 10 and 15, T. 17 S., R. 19 E.	18
DMEA-4434 McManmon, John	Joe Dandy- Red Idol- Independence claims (mercury)	Sec. 31, T. 17 S., R. 17 E.	19
DMEA-3617 Farmer, K.B., and McManmon, John	Leeta and Doris claims (mercury)	Secs. 5 and 6, T. 18 S., R. 17 E.	20
DMEA-3382 McManmon, John, and Bayley, B. R.	Pinckney 1 and 2 claims (mercury)	Sec. 8, T.18 S., R. 17 E.	21
DMA-2222 Pigmon, owen	Platner mine (mercury)	Secs. 18 and 19, T. 18 S., R. 17 E.	22
DMEA-4757 Platner Mining Corp.	Platner mine (mercury)	Secs. 18 and 19, T. 18 S., R. 17 E.	Application

CROOK COUNTY-Cont.

DMEA-4752 Amundson, A. D.	Mother Lode group (mercury)	Secs. 30 and 31, T. 18 S., R. 17 E.	23
------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------	----

CURRY COUNTY

OME-6533	Canyon Consol.	Sec. 21, T. 32 S., R. 13 W.	26
----------	----------------	-----------------------------	----









