Mr. Ivan Thompson
Huntington,
Oregon

Re: Docket No. DMA 2014 - Nickel and Asbestos
Nickel Dome No. 1 & No. 2 Claims
NW¼ Sec. 34, T. 13 S., R. 43
Baker County, Oregon

Dear Mr. Thompson:

Your application for exploration assistance and other data concerning the subject area available to us in Washington have been carefully reviewed.

This information, while noting some low grade nickel mineralization on your property, indicates that, geologically, there is little probability of making a significant mineral discovery. We regret, therefore, to inform you that your application is denied.

We wish to thank you for your interest in the Defense Minerals Program and for bringing this property to our attention.

Sincerely yours,

C. O. Mittendorf

Acting Administrator
Defense Minerals Exploration
Administration

TLChapman'lm
8/6/52

cc: Admn. Reading File
Docket
H. W. Davis, USBM
T. P. Thayer, USGS
Field Team Reg. II
Operating Committee
G. C. Selfridge
T. L. Chapman

Acting Administrator, DMRA August 6, 1952

Iron and Ferro-Alloy Division, DMRA

Denial of exploration project with no definite amount specified.
Docket No. DMA 2014 - Nickel and asbestos
Ivan Thompson and Mrs. J. B. Robertson
Nickel Dome No. 1 and No. 2 Claims
Baker County, Oregon

The denial of the subject application by this Division is based on the following information:

1. Nickel occurs in a wide peridotite zone, probably in the form of an oxide or silicate. Samples indicate the grade to be very low. Apparently the nickel is of a type and grade which is common to this type of rock. The indications are that, geologically, there is little possibility of making a significant mineral discovery.

2. A shaft about 100 feet deep shows no change in the rock or mineralization.

3. No asbestos was noted on the property.

4. The field team and Commodity Division of the U.S. Geological Survey recommends denial.

George C. Selfridge

G. C. Selfridge, Chief
Iron and Ferro-Alloy Division

TLChapman'lm
8/6/52

cc: Admn. Reading File
Docket
G. C. Selfridge
T. L. Chapman

IN REPLY REFER TO:

G-MD-CF

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

August 1, 1952

Memorandum

To: George C. Selfridge, DMEA

From: D. M. Lemmon, USGS

Subject: Field Report DMEA 2014 - Nickel and asbestos
Nickel Dome No. 1 and No. 2 claims
Ivan Thompson and J. S. Robertson
Baker County, Oregon

The Nickel Dome claims were examined June 6, 1952 by John D. Bardill, Metallurgist, Bureau of Mines. Bardill reports that the deposit consists of peridotite, parts of which contain 0.1 to 0.2 percent of nickel. No commercial asbestos is present.

I concur with Bardill's recommendation that the application be denied because the material exposed has no value and there is no geologic likelihood of finding ore by exploration.

D. M. Lemmon

DMLemmon:gt

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

1201 North Division St.
Spokane 2, Wash.
July 22, 1952

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Defense Minerals Administration
RECEIVED
JUL 28 1952

Sec GCL 8/5/52

MEMORANDUM

To: Chairman, Operating Committee, DMEA

From: DMEA Field Team, Region II

Subject: Report of field examination of Nickel Dome No. 1 and No. 2 Claims, Baker County, Oregon, Ivan Thompson and J. S. Robertson Docket No. DMA 2014X (nickel and asbestos)

Attached are four copies of a report by John D. Bardill, Metallurgist, U. S. Bureau of Mines, on the subject property.

The Field Team concurs with the examining engineer and recommends that the application be denied.

By DMEA Field Team, Region II

A. E. Weissenborn, Exec. Officer
(U. S. Geological Survey)

M. E. Volin, Member
(U. S. Bureau of Mines)

Enclosures

cc: Wash. (3)
USGS (1)

1201 N. Division St.
Spokane 2, Wash.

July 21, 1951

MEMORANDUM

To: M. E. Volin, Member, DMEA Field Team, Region II

From: John D. Bardill, Metallurgist, Mining Division, Region II

Subject: Field examination: Docket No. DMA 2014X (nickel and asbestos), Nickel Dome No. 1 and No. 2 Claims, Baker County, Oregon - Ivan Thompson and J. S. Robertson

RECOMMENDATION

Applicant was only seeking advice about the best means of prospecting his claims and had no idea how much money would be required or how it would be used.

The application for exploration assistance to prospect this deposit should be denied because the nickel content of the peridotite is too low.

LOCATION

The two claims are located in Baker County, NW¼ of sec. 34, T. 13S., R. 43. The property is about 13 miles northwest of Huntington by dirt roads through Rye Valley, then by trail several miles in sage brush country. It would be very difficult to locate the claims without a guide.

The property was visited June 6, 1952, with Ivan Thompson. It consists of two unpatented claims, Nickel Dome Nos. 1 and 2, located in applicants' names.

COMPETENCE OF APPLICANT

Applicants are prospector and storekeeper respectively and would probably not be competent to finance or direct a mining operation. They would probably plan to sell or lease the property if it developed to the point where it would be mined.

Reviewed by
DMEA OPERATING COMMITTEE
8-1-52
(date)

DEPOSIT

The deposit appears to be a peridotite with a serpentine hanging wall and schist footwall. Because of a heavy rain during the examination, the limits of the deposit were not delineated, but applicant states he has traced it along the strike for about 1500 feet and that its width is about 600 feet. The strike is roughly N. 55° E. Only exposures of the deposit and walls are outcroppings and an old caved shaft reported to have been about 100 feet deep.

Applicant states that assays have shown several tenths of a percent of nickel. The nickel mineral has not been positively identified but probably is garnierite.

One sample was chipped from an outcropping and assayed 0.11 percent nickel. Another grab sample from the old shaft dump assayed 0.17 percent nickel.

No asbestos of value was observed.

ORE RESERVES

The peridotite is too low grade to be classed as an ore.

CONCLUSION

The nickel content of the deposit is too low to be of economic interest.

John D. Sardill

cc: BLM, Spokane
Wash., D.C. (4)

APR 30 1952 40

Mr. A. N. Weinsenberm
Executive Officer, Region II
South 157 Howard Street
Spokane 8, Washington

Re: Docket No. UMA 2014X - Nickel and Asbestos
The Nickel Dome No. 1 & No. 2 Claims
Baker County, Oregon

Dear Mr. Weinsenberm:

We are writing you again to call your attention to the above noted docket.

Since an examination of this property was contemplated, as indicated by your letter of August 24, 1951, and confirmed by your letter of February 4, 1952, we would appreciate knowing whether or not the examination has been definitely scheduled.

Possibly the property does not warrant an examination and if the applicant will not furnish the requested information, we can write him to the effect that his application will be cancelled unless the requested information is forthcoming within a reasonable period of time.

What are your suggestions on this matter?

Sincerely yours,

C. O. Mittendorf

Acting Administrator
Defense Minerals Exploration
Administration

GCSelfridge'lm
4/29/52

cc: Admn. Reading File
Docket
H. W. Davis, USBM
T. P. Thayer, USGS
Field Team Reg. II
G. C. Selfridge
Operating Committee

JAN 29 1952

Mr. A. E. Weissenborn
Executive Officer, Region II
South 157 Howard Street
Spokane 8, Washington

Re: Docket No. DMA 201AX - Nickel and Asbestos
Near Baker, Oregon

Dear Mr. Weissenborn:

Review of our file shows that under date of August 24, 1951, you expected to have a field party examine the property of the subject docket, whenever the field party was in that section of Oregon.

Please advise us as to the progress of your investigation at this time.

Sincerely yours,

C. O. Mittendorf

Acting Administrator
Defense Minerals Exploration
Administration

GGGentry:lm
1/25/52

cc: Admn. Reading File
Docket
H. W. Davis, USBM
T. P. Thayer, USGS
Field Team Reg. II
G. C. Selfridge
G. G. Gentry