IN REPLY REFER TO:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
Defense Minerals Exploration Administration
Denver Federal Center
Denver 2, Colorado

May 26, 1954

Memorandum

To: DMEA Field Team, Region IV

From: A. H. Koschmann

Subject: DMEA Docket 3318, L. D. Poor Mining Company, Alamo Asbestos #1 and #2 claims, Gila County, Arizona

Enclosed are 9 copies of a geologic report by F. N. Houser and Leonid Brynir of the U. S. Geological Survey covering the above docket.

It has been recommended that the application be denied.

E. N. Harshman
for A. H. Koschmann
Supervising Geologist
Colorado-Wyoming

Enclosures 9

Reviewed by
DMEA OPERATING COMMITTEE
6-11-54
(date)

IN REPLY REFER TO:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

BOX 4126 University Station
Tucson, Arizona

May 20, 1954

Memorandum

To: A. H. Koschmann

From: John N. Faick

Subject: Examination Report, DMEA 3318,
L. D. Poor Mining Co.,
Alamo Asbestos #1 and #2 claims, Gila County, Arizona

Enclosed are the original and 8 copies of the subject report by F. N. Houser and Leonid Bryner, Geologists, U.S.Geological Survey. It is recommended that the proposed exploration loan be denied because of the geologic unfavorability for a significant quantity of asbestos.

No representative of the Bureau of Mines was available for this examination. It is not expected that the Bureau will make an examination in light of the above recommendation.

This report and the recommendation that the application be denied have my approval.

John N. Faick
Geologist

JNF:ms

cc. Koschmann (8)
Storms

Enclosures

Reviewed by
DMEA OPERATING COMMITTEE
6-11-54
(date)

ALAMO ASBESTOS NOS. 1 AND 2 CLAIMS

(ASBESTOS)

GILA COUNTY, ARIZONA

DMEA 3318

L. D. Poor Mining Company, Applicant

by

F. N. Houser and Leonid Bryner

Geologists, U. S. Geological Survey

Reviewed by
DMEA OPERATING COMMITTEE
6-11-54
(date)

ALAMO ASBESTOS NOS. 1 AND 2 CLAIMS
(ASBESTOS)
GILA COUNTY, ARIZONA
D.M.E.A. 3318
L. D. Poor Mining Company, Applicant
by
F. N. Houser and Leonid Bryner
Geologists, U. S. Geological Survey

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
ASBESTOS OCCURRENCES	2
CONCLUSIONS	3

INTRODUCTION

The L. D. Poor Mining Company proposed the building of an access road to Alamo Asbestos No. 1 and No. 2 claims and proposed exploration of the property by stripping the outcrop and by driving two 75-foot adits. The applicant's estimated cost of this proposed work is $7,380, of which the Government's share would be 75 percent, or $5,535.

The Alamo Asbestos Nos. 1 and 2 claims are located about 30 miles north-northeast of Globe, Arizona, in the Blue House Mountain quadrangle (1.2 miles north and 4.2 miles west of the southeast corner of the quadrangle). The claims are reached from U. S. Highway 60 by going west on the Regal Mine road 6.0 miles to a small sign indicating "Regal Mine"; turning left on the "Old Regal" road for 2.2 miles (last mile negotiable by jeep) and walking west about 0.3 mile. The writers examined these claims on May 11, 1954.

The claims are oriented northerly up the gentle south slope of an east-trending ridge; the Alamo Asbestos #1 is on the west and the Alamo Asbestos #2 is on the east. According to the claim notices, the discovery monuments on both claims are located 1000 feet from their south boundaries and 500 feet from their north boundaries. The No. 1 discovery monument is 700 feet N. 70° W. of No. 2 discovery monument.

It is unknown whether there has been any production of asbestos from these claims, but if so, it probably was negligible.

ASBESTOS OCCURRENCES

The fiber on these claims is in a 12- to 20-foot thick series of limestone beds of the lower Mescal, which is overlain and underlain by diabase. The limestone strikes generally west and dips about 5 degrees north so that it is exposed in the dip slope which forms the north side of the ridge. About 100 feet west of the No. 1 monument the diabase cuts through this limestone, connecting the upper and lower diabase sills. The limestone is presumed to be cut by diabase east of the No. 2 monument, but this could not be confirmed because of lack of adequate exposure.

Flat-lying lenses and veinlets of fiber are exposed in pits located near the monuments of either claim; a trace of fiber is exposed at one outcrop between and a little north of the pits. No fiber was noted at two other small pits, one about 270 feet east of the No. 1 monument and the other about 85 feet west of the No. 2 monument.

A northeast-trending pit, which is located 40 feet N. 63° E. from No. 1 monument, exposed $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 2 inches total of soft fiber in veinlets averaging about 1/8 inch. This fiber occurs in a zone 14-18 inches thick consisting of thin- to medium-bedded massive serpentinized limestone. The zone in the pit thins into the hill, where it contains only serpentinized limestone. The limestone itself appears less favorable at the northeast end of the pit; and consists of 8- to 10-inch beds of massive serpentinized limestone interbedded with 2- to 4-inch beds of soft serpentinized limestone.

The pit and adit at the No. 2 claim trends N. 23° E. into the hill for a distance of 25 feet, at which point it is caved. The pit is located 65 feet N. 50° E. of the monument. Total linear exposure of the fiber zone observed here is about 20 feet. The fiber in this zone is concentrated as small lenses in serpentine nodules and irregular masses of well serpentinized limestone in 4 feet of massive, slightly- to moderately-serpentinized limestone. Total semi-harsh fiber in the 4-foot section is about 3/4 inch; the lenses rarely exceed 1/8 inch in thickness.

CONCLUSIONS

It is recommended that the Government loan for the proposed exploration be denied because:

(1) In the #1 pit the fiber is not of economically minable thickness, the average length of the fiber is short and the amount of fiber diminishes rapidly into the hill. This, combined with the general thin-beddedness and softness of much of the limestone section, does not favor an increase nor a persistence of fiber content with increasing depth into the hill.

(2) The nodular serpentine, the apparent weak serpentinization of the limestone, thin fiber veinlets, and the scarcity of fiber are not favorable for more ore at the No. 2 pit.

(3) The apparent absence of fiber and significant amounts of serpentine on the claims along the fairly well exposed limestone outcrop on the north side and south side of the ridge does not indicate persistence away from the known occurrences at the pits.

IN REPLY REFER TO:

G-MD-CNM

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

June 17, 1954

Memorandum

REVIEW OF FIELD TEAM REPORT ON APPLICATION DMEA-3318 (Asbestos).

To: L. G. Heuk, Defense Minerals Exploration Administration
From: D. A. Brobst, U. S. Geological Survey
Applicant: L. D. Poor Mining Co.
Name of property: Alamo Asbestos #1 and #2 claims
Location of property: Gila Co., Arizona
Date of field team examination: May 11, 1954
Authorship of field team report: F.N. Houser and Leonid Bryner
Field team's recommendation: Denial

Comments: None

ACTION RECOMMENDED: Follow field team's recommendation

D. A. Brobst

Copy to: DMEA (3)

June 16, 1954

Memorandum

To: Administrator

From: Nonmetallic Minerals Division

Subject: Concurrence of denial - Docket No. DMEA-3318 - Asbestos
L. D. Poor
Alamo Asbestos Mining Claims
Gila County, Arizona

The subject application denied in Region IV, under their delegation of authority, has been recommended for denial by the Geological Survey. The Bureau of Mines did not participate in the examination. The subject application denied because the geologic improbability of making a significant discovery is concurred in by the Nonmetallic Minerals Division as the geologic environment is not favorable and the degree of serpentization is weak.

LGHouk:gad 6/16/54
Copy to: Admr. R. File
Mr. Houk

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

COPY

224 New Customhouse
Denver 2, Colorado

June 3, 1954

Mr. L. D. Poor
265 North Pine Street
Globe, Arizona

Re: Docket No. 3318 (Asbestos) L.D.Poor, Alamo Asbestos mining claims, Gila County, Arizona

Dear Mr. Poor:

Reference is made to your application for Government aid on your Alamo Asbestos claims located in Gila County, Arizona.

Projects approved by the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration must, in its judgment, show definite promise of yielding material of acceptable grade and in quantities that will significantly improve the mineral supply position for the National Defense Program.

A careful study of your property and data available to this agency reveals that the probability of disclosing mineable reserves of asbestos is not considered sufficiently promising to justify Government participation. Under these circumstances, we regret to advise that your application for exploration aid is denied.

We are returning herewith the copy of your lease submitted with your application.

Very truly yours,

/s/ W. H. King

/s/ E. N. Harshman for
A. H. Koschmann
Field Team, Region IV

Enclosure
RDB:es
cc: Docket 3318
Administrator, DMEA
Storms
Shride
Koschmann (2)
Chron.

Reviewed by
DMEA OPERATING COMMITTEE
6-11-54
(date)