IN REPLY REFER TO:

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

August 10, 1953

E. Wm. Ellis, DMEA Member
Uranium Commodity Committee
A. P. Butler, Jr., USGS Member
Uranium Commodity Committee
Final Field Team report, Docket 3067, (Uranium), Verne M. Young, Green River, Utah, applicant; Yellow Nat claim, Henry Mt. district, Garfield County, Utah

Review and Comment

The Field Team report concerning exploration on the property identified above has been reviewed.

As a result of an examination and a discussion with an AEC geologist familiar with the area, the geologist member of the Field Team found that ore bodies were contained in mineralized logs which were small and scattered and it is not possible to predict the trend of sedimentary formation in this area. As the mineralized logs are too small for core drilling targets and drifting or bulldozer stripping would be too expensive for the possible returns, the Field Team recommends that the application be denied.

Recommendations

I concur in the recommendation of the Field Team that government assistance for exploration be denied.

Copy to: E. Wm. Ellis - 2

STANDARD FORM NO. 64

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Denied

TO : E. Wm. Ellis, DMEA Member
Uranium Commodity Committee

DATE: August 10, 1953

FROM : A. P. Butler, Jr., USGS Member
Uranium Commodity Committee

SUBJECT: Final Field Team report, Docket 3067, (Uranium), Verne M. Young, Green River, Utah, applicant; Yellow Nat claim, Henry Mt. district, Garfield County, Utah

Review and Comment

The Field Team report concerning exploration on the property identified above has been reviewed.

As a result of an examination and a discussion with an AEC geologist familiar with the area, the geologist member of the Field Team found that ore bodies were contained in mineralized logs which were small and scattered and it is not possible to predict the trend of sedimentary formation in this area. As the mineralized logs are too small for core drilling targets and drifting, or bulldozer stripping would be too expensive for the possible returns, the Field Team recommends that the application be denied.

Recommendations

I concur in the recommendation of the Field Team that government assistance for exploration be denied.

Arthur P. Butler, Jr.

Copy to: E. Wm. Ellis - 2

IN REPLY REFER TO:

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

AUG 11 1953

August 10, 1953

E. Wm. Ellis, DMEA Member
Uranium Commodity Committee
A. P. Butler, Jr., USGS Member
Uranium Commodity Committee
Final Field Team report, Docket 3067, (Uranium), Verne M. Young, Green River, Utah, applicant; Yellow Nat claim, Henry Mt. district, Garfield County, Utah

Review and Comment

The Field Team report concerning exploration on the property identified above has been reviewed.

As a result of an examination and a discussion with an AEC geologist familiar with the area, the geologist member of the Field Team found that ore bodies were contained in mineralized logs which were small and scattered and it is not possible to predict the trend of sedimentary formation in this area. As the mineralized logs are too small for core drilling targets and drifting or bulldozer stripping would be too expensive for the possible returns, the Field Team recommends that the application be denied.

Recommendations

I concur in the recommendation of the Field Team that government assistance for exploration be denied.

Copy to: E. Wm. Ellis - 2

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF MINES
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

August 5, 1953

Memorandum

To: E. Wm. Ellis, DMEA Member
Uranium Commodity Committee, Room 4640

From: R. F. Griffith, Acting for H. D. Keiser,
Bureau of Mines Member Uranium Commodity Committee

Subject: Final Report, DMEA Docket 3067 (Uranium), Verne Young,
Yellow Nat Claim, Garfield County, Utah.

I have reviewed the subject report and am in agreement with the recommendation contained in the report that the application be denied. This recommendation is in accord with the views expressed by R. C. Gerhard, AEC geologist, and R. P. Fischer, Acting District Supervisor, Geological Survey.

The report has been forwarded to the Chief, Minerals Division, Bureau of Mines, in accord with the routing slip attached thereto.

R. F. Griffith

R. F. Griffith

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF MINES
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

August [illegible] 1953

Memorandum

To: E. Wm. Ellis, DMEA Member
Uranium Commodity Committee, Room 4640

From: R. F. Griffith, Acting for H. D. Keiser,
Bureau of Mines Member Uranium Commodity Committee

Subject: Final Report, DMEA Docket 3067 (Uranium), Verne Young,
Yellow Hat Claim, Garfield County, Utah.

I have reviewed the subject report and am in agreement with the recommendation contained in the report that the application be denied. This recommendation is in accord with the views expressed by R. C. Gerhard, AEC geologist, and R. P. Fischer, Acting District Supervisor, Geological Survey.

The report has been forwarded to the Chief, Minerals Division, Bureau of Mines, in accord with the routing slip attached thereto.

R. F. Griffith

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

224 New Customhouse
Denver 2, Colorado

July 22, 1953.

Memorandum

To: Administrator, Defense Minerals Exploration Administration
Attention: 200

From: Field Team, Region IV

Subject: Final Report, DMEA Docket 3067 (Uranium), Verne Young, Yellow Nat Claim, Garfield County, Utah.

Enclosed are four copies of the final report on the subject docket, two copies of Form 3b and a copy of the letter of denial to the applicant.

W. H. King
W. H. King

A. H. Koschmann
A. H. Koschmann

Enclosures

Reviewed by
DMEA OPERATING COMMITTEE
7-31-53
(date)

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

224 New Customhouse
Denver 2, Colorado

July 22, 1953.

Mr. Verne W. Young
5525 Federal Blvd.
Denver, Colorado

Re: Docket DMEA-3067

Dear Mr. Young:

Reference is made to your application for Government aid on the Yellow Nat Claim.

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 uranium by your proposed exploration program is not considered sufficiently promising to justify Government participation. Under these circumstances, we regret to advise that your application for exploration aid is denied.

Very truly yours,

W. H. King
W. H. King
Field Team, Region IV

A. H. Koschmann
A. H. Koschmann
Field Team, Region IV

HMC:cwm
cc: Administrator, DMEA
ERGordon
RPFischer
SRWilson
Subject
AHKoschmann (2)
Chron.

Reviewed by
DMEA OPERATING COMMITTEE
7-31-53
(date)

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

200 New Customhouse
Denver 2, Colorado

June 26, 1953

Memorandum

To: DMEA Field Team, Region IV

From: A. H. Koschmann

Subject: DMEA Docket 3067, Yellow Nat Claim, Garfield County, Utah

Enclosed are 11 copies of the geologic report by J. Fred Smith of the U. S. Geological Survey covering the above docket.

It has been recommended that the loan be denied.

The brochure is enclosed.

A. H. Koschmann
Supervising Geologist
Colorado-Wyoming

Enclosures (12)

Reviewed by
DMEA OPERATING COMMITTEE
7-31-53
(date)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
P. O. BOX 360
GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

June 25, 1953

Memorandum

To: A. H. Koschmann
Field Team, Region IV

From: R. P. Fischer
Colorado Plateau District

Subject: DMEA Docket 3067, Yellow Nat claim, Garfield County, Utah

Transmitted herewith are eleven copies of a geologic report on the Yellow Nat claim, Garfield County, Utah. This claim is owned by Verne W. Young, who has applied for a DMEA loan to explore for uranium on this claim. The proposed exploration includes 2,000 feet of core drilling, 600 feet of drifting, and 12 days of bulldozer work. The total estimated cost is $19,248.00.

The attached report was prepared by J. F. Smith and is based on a recent field examination of the property and on a discussion with R. C. Gerhard, AEC geologist, who is familiar with the applicant's claim and the surrounding area.

The known mineralized material on the Yellow Nat claim is restricted to three small fossil logs that crop out in exposures of the Morrison formation. Other mineralized logs and a few small sandstone ore bodies, apparently resembling ill-defined rolls, are known on a few nearby claims, but no large ore bodies have been discovered in the Morrison formation in this area.

Because of the small size of the known ore bodies and their scattered distribution, and because there are no known geologic guides that can be applied effectively in finding the expectable ore bodies, exploration work likely will not find much if any ore. For these reasons, the report recommends that the application be denied. Mr. Gerhard of AEC is reported to have a similar appraisal of the exploration possibilities.

I concur with the recommendation in the report.

R P Fischer

R. P. Fischer
Acting District Supervisor

Enclosures 11

Reviewed by
DMEA OPERATING COMMITTEE
7-31-53
(date)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

DOUGLAS McKAY, SECRETARY

DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION

REPORT OF EXAMINATION BY FIELD TEAM

REGION IV

DMEA 3067 (Uranium)

Yellow Nat claim, Garfield County, Utah

J. Fred Smith, Geologist
U. S. Geological Survey

June 1953

Reviewed by
DMEA OPERATING COMMITTEE
7-31-53
(date)

DMEA 3067 (Uranium)
YELLOW NAT CLAIM, GARFIELD COUNTY, UTAH

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

Mr. Verne W. Young of Green River, Utah, has applied (Docket 3067) to the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration for a loan to explore for uranium on the Yellow Nat claim in the Henry Mountains mining district, Garfield County, Utah. The application calls for 2,000 feet of core drilling, 600 feet of drifting, and 12 days of bulldozer work to strip the gravel and slope wash cover to expose the Salt Wash member of the Morrison formation. The total estimated cost is $19,248, of which 90 percent, or $17,323.00, would be loaned by DMEA.

This report is prepared on the basis of discussion with R. C. Gerhard, geologist, U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, who did geologic reconnaissance in the area and on a one-half day examination of the property by members of the Geological Survey. In addition, the map and report of the Henry Mountains area, Little Rockies district (A. Mastrovich, et. al., Union Mines Development Corporation, 1944, covers the area and was available during the field examination.

It is recommended that the application be denied for the following reasons: (1) The ore bodies observed on this claim and most of those in the general area are mineralized logs that are too small for targets for core drilling; and (2) the Atomic Energy Commission geologist reports that it is not possible to determine sedimentary trends and channels in this area, and consequently to determine projected trends of mineralized logs; exploration by drifting, then, could not be directed systematically and would be a random search.

Stripping of the gravel cover might be more feasible than drilling or drifting, but as there is so little geologic information that would be useful in guiding the work, and as the mineralized masses (logs) that might be found are expected to be small and scattered, even this work would appear to be impracticable and is not recommended.

GEOLOGY

At the Yellow Nat claim approximately 130 feet of the Salt Wash member of the Morrison formation are exposed along a gully. Neither the base nor the top of the member are exposed. (See accompanying sketch map and section.) Gravel, probably as much as 65 feet thick and composed chiefly of igneous rock fragments and slope wash from the gravel cap cover the rest of the claim. The Salt Wash member is chiefly fine- to medium-grained calcareous cross-bedded sandstone that contains some pebbly layers and short lenses of conglomeratic sandstone as much as 2 feet thick. Pebbles in the conglomerate are generally one-half inch or less in diameter. Sand grains are chiefly quartz with some chert and feldspar. The beds dip about 3° NW and strike N. 50° E.

In this general area the Salt Wash member of the Jurassic Morrison formation is underlain by the Summerville formation of the Jurassic San Rafael group and overlain by the Brushy Basin member of the Morrison formation. A cross section on the Union Mines Development Corporation map and sections (Henry Mountains area, Little Rockies district, by A. Mastrovich, et. al., 1944) shows the Summerville formation 100 feet thick, the Salt Wash member of the Morrison formation 450 feet thick, and the Brushy Basin member of the Morrison formation 300 feet thick. This section is about 2½ miles south-southwest of the Yellow Nat claim. A section about 1 mile north shows the Salt Wash slightly more than 400 feet thick.



Sketch map of geology of Yellow Nat claim, Henry Mtns. mining district, Garfield Co., Utah
(From Brunton and tape traverse by J.F. Smith and R.G. Luedke, June 17, 1953)

x Silicified log - mineralized



Sketch section along gully on Yellow Nat claim, Henry Mtns. mining district, Garfield Co., Utah

J. F. Smith and R. G. Luedke

ORE DEPOSITS

The only mineralized rock observed on the Yellow Nat claim is in three silicified logs (see accompanying sketch map and section). Log A is 15 inches wide and 5 inches thick and appears to trend about N. 15° E. The long dimension is not exposed. Log B is about 3 inches in diameter, and log C about 8 inches in diameter.

Coatings of carnotite (?) have formed along seams and fractures in the logs. Scintillator (PRI Model 111) readings of a maximum of 0.3 Mr/hr and an average of about 0.12 Mr/hr were obtained on the logs. This ranged from about 4 to about 10 times the background readings of 0.03 to 0.05 Mr/hr. Adjacent to and in the general vicinity of the logs the sandstone has a pinkish red hematite stain that essentially follows the bedding. This stained rock is not abnormally radioactive.

The three logs are about 32 and 44 feet above the base of the exposed Salt Wash on the claim. As the actual base of the Salt Wash is not exposed on or immediately adjacent to the claim, the distance of the logs above the base of the member cannot be determined.

On the Woodruff group south of the Yellow Nat several shallow pits have exposed roll-like mineralied bodies with some associated carbonaceous material. These bodies follow the bedding in general but cut across the bedding in places. One "roll" is 24 feet long and has a maximum thickness of about 6 inches. The other is almost 15 feet long with a maximum thickness of 1 foot. The pits are too shallow for a third dimension to be measured. Associated with the shorter "roll" are carbonaceous stringers as much as 1 foot long and 1½ inches thick and a carbonized log 1½ feet wide and 3 inches thick. The mineralized rock is dark brown fine-grained sandstone containing some yellow staining. The dark brown and yellow material impregnate the sandstone and are probably vanadium and uranium

(carnotite ?) minerals. In places the sandstone is impregnated and coated with a dark bluish mineral that is probably vanadium. Red ocherous material coats local spots. Sandstone above the "rolls" is limonite stained, and the sandstone below is relatively clean and white. Readings on a Scintillator (PRI Model 111) were a maximum of 0.85 Mr/hr and an average of 0.5 Mr/hr along the "rolls". According to the AEC geologist, a sample from one of the bodies assayed about 1.2 percent U_3O_8 and 5.0 percent V_2O_5.

These "rolls" apparently are at about the same stratigraphic position in the Salt Wash as the mineralized logs on the Yellow Nat claim. Gravel and rubble covering the slopes between the claims precludes the possibility of tracing beds between them.

The AEC geologist reports that log deposits on the Walters group about 3/4 mile north of the Yellow Nat assayed about 0.15 percent U_3O_8 and 12 to 15 percent $CaCO_3$.

According to the AEC geologist, it is not possible to determine sedimentary trends or channels through this area. Consequently, trends of the zone of "rolls" on the Woodruff group or of the mineralized logs on the Yellow Nat claim cannot be projected.

No "rolls" similar to those on the Woodruff group were observed on the Yellow Nat claim.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Exposed mineralized rock on the Yellow Nat claim is in three silicified logs about 32 and 44 feet above the lowest exposed beds in the Salt Wash member of the Morrison formation. Except along a gully at the east end of the claim, the bedrock is covered by gravel and slope wash. Small roll-like bodies have been prospected on the Woodruff group to the south, but no similar bodies were observed on the Yellow Nat.

The mineralized logs are too small for targets for core drilling. According to the Atomic Energy Commission geologist who worked in this area, sedimentary trends or channels, and, consequently, trends of zones of logs or "rolls" cannot be determined in this area. As a result, trends for locating drill sites or for drifting cannot be established. For these reasons, it is recommended that the application be denied.

Bulldozer stripping of the gravel and slope wash cover along the horizon of the logs might expose other mineralized logs that could be mined at the surface. Such logs, however, are expected to be so small and scattered that even this type of exploration does not seem practicable and is not recommended.

8/5/53 pc

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

224 New Customhouse
Denver 2, Colorado

July 22, 1953.

Memorandum

To: Administrator, Defense Minerals Exploration Administration
Attention: 200

From: Field Team, Region IV

Subject: Final Report, DMEA Docket 3067 (Uranium), Verne Young, Yellow Hat Claim, Garfield County, Utah.

Enclosed are four copies of the final report on the subject docket, two copies of Form 3b and a copy of the letter of denial to the applicant.

W. H. King
W. H. King

A. H. Koschmann
A. H. Koschmann

Enclosures

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

200 New Customhouse
Denver 2, Colorado

June 26, 1953

Memorandum

To: DMEA Field Team, Region IV

From: A. H. Koschmann

Subject: DMEA Docket 3067, Yellow Nat Claim, Garfield County, Utah

Enclosed are 11 copies of the geologic report by J. Fred Smith of the U. S. Geological Survey covering the above docket.

It has been recommended that the loan be denied.

The brochure is enclosed.

A. H. Koschmann
A. H. Koschmann
Supervising Geologist
Colorado-Wyoming

Enclosures (12)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
P. O. BOX 360
GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

June 25, 1953

Memorandum

To: A. H. Koschmann
Field Team, Region IV

From: R. P. Fischer
Colorado Plateau District

Subject: DMEA Docket 3067, Yellow Nat claim, Garfield County, Utah

Transmitted herewith are eleven copies of a geologic report on the Yellow Nat claim, Garfield County, Utah. This claim is owned by Verne W. Young, who has applied for a DMEA loan to explore for uranium on this claim. The proposed exploration includes 2,000 feet of core drilling, 600 feet of drifting, and 12 days of bulldozer work. The total estimated cost is $19,248.00.

The attached report was prepared by J. F. Smith and is based on a recent field examination of the property and on a discussion with R. C. Gerhard, AEC geologist, who is familiar with the applicant's claim and the surrounding area.

The known mineralized material on the Yellow Nat claim is restricted to three small fossil logs that crop out in exposures of the Morrison formation. Other mineralized logs and a few small sandstone ore bodies, apparently resembling ill-defined rolls, are known on a few nearby claims, but no large ore bodies have been discovered in the Morrison formation in this area.

Because of the small size of the known ore bodies and their scattered distribution, and because there are no known geologic guides that can be applied effectively in finding the expectable ore bodies, exploration work likely will not find much if any ore. For these reasons, the report recommends that the application be denied. Mr. Gerhard of AEC is reported to have a similar appraisal of the exploration possibilities.

I concur with the recommendation in the report.

R P Fischer

R. P. Fischer
Acting District Supervisor

Enclosures 11

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

DOUGLAS McKAY, SECRETARY

DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION

REPORT OF EXAMINATION BY FIELD TEAM

REGION IV

DMEA 3067 (Uranium)

Yellow Nat claim, Garfield County, Utah

J. Fred Smith, Geologist
U. S. Geological Survey

June 1953

DMEA 3067 (Uranium)
YELLOW NAT CLAIM, GARFIELD COUNTY, UTAH

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

Mr. Verne W. Young of Green River, Utah, has applied (Docket 3067) to the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration for a loan to explore for uranium on the Yellow Nat claim in the Henry Mountains mining district, Garfield County, Utah. The application calls for 2,000 feet of core drilling, 600 feet of drifting, and 12 days of bulldozer work to strip the gravel and slope wash cover to expose the Salt Wash member of the Morrison formation. The total estimated cost is $19,248, of which 90 percent, or $17,323.00, would be loaned by DMEA.

This report is prepared on the basis of discussion with R. C. Gerhard, geologist, U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, who did geologic reconnaissance in the area and on a one-half day examination of the property by members of the Geological Survey. In addition, the map and report of the Henry Mountains area, Little Rockies district (A. Mastrovich, et. al., Union Mines Development Corporation, 1944, covers the area and was available during the field examination.

It is recommended that the application be denied for the following reasons: (1) The ore bodies observed on this claim and most of those in the general area are mineralized logs that are too small for targets for core drilling; and (2) the Atomic Energy Commission geologist reports that it is not possible to determine sedimentary trends and channels in this area, and consequently to determine projected trends of mineralized logs; exploration by drifting, then, could not be directed systematically and would be a random search.

Stripping of the gravel cover might be more feasible than drilling or drifting, but as there is so little geologic information that would be useful in guiding the work, and as the mineralized masses (logs) that might be found are expected to be small and scattered, even this work would appear to be impracticable and is not recommended.

GEOLOGY

At the Yellow Nat claim approximately 130 feet of the Salt Wash member of the Morrison formation are exposed along a gully. Neither the base nor the top of the member are exposed. (See accompanying sketch map and section.) Gravel, probably as much as 65 feet thick and composed chiefly of igneous rock fragments and slope wash from the gravel cap cover the rest of the claim. The Salt Wash member is chiefly fine- to medium-grained calcareous cross-bedded sandstone that contains some pebbly layers and short lenses of conglomeratic sandstone as much as 2 feet thick. Pebbles in the conglomerate are generally one-half inch or less in diameter. Sand grains are chiefly quartz with some chert and feldspar. The beds dip about 3° NW and strike N. 50° E.

In this general area the Salt Wash member of the Jurassic Morrison formation is underlain by the Summerville formation of the Jurassic San Rafael group and overlain by the Brushy Basin member of the Morrison formation. A cross section on the Union Mines Development Corporation map and sections (Henry Mountains area, Little Rockies district, by A. Mastrovich, et. al., 1944) shows the Summerville formation 100 feet thick, the Salt Wash member of the Morrison formation 450 feet thick, and the Brushy Basin member of the Morrison formation 300 feet thick. This section is about $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles south-southwest of the Yellow Nat claim. A section about 1 mile north shows the Salt Wash slightly more than 400 feet thick.



Sketch map of geology of Yellow Nat claim, Henry Mtns. mining district, Garfield Co., Utah
(From Brunton and tape traverse by J. F. Smith and R. G. Luedke, June 17, 1953)

x Silicified log - mineralized



Sketch section along gully on Yellow Nat claim, Henry Mtns. mining district, Garfield Co., Utah

J. F. Smith and R. G. Luedke

ORE DEPOSITS

The only mineralized rock observed on the Yellow Nat claim is in three silicified logs (see accompanying sketch map and section). Log A is 15 inches wide and 5 inches thick and appears to trend about N. 15° E. The long dimension is not exposed. Log B is about 3 inches in diameter, and log C about 8 inches in diameter.

Coatings of carnotite (?) have formed along seams and fractures in the logs. Scintillator (PRI Model 111) readings of a maximum of 0.3 Mr/hr and an average of about 0.12 Mr/hr were obtained on the logs. This ranged from about 4 to about 10 times the background readings of 0.03 to 0.05 Mr/hr. Adjacent to and in the general vicinity of the logs the sandstone has a pinkish red hematite stain that essentially follows the bedding. This stained rock is not abnormally radioactive.

The three logs are about 32 and 44 feet above the base of the exposed Salt Wash on the claim. As the actual base of the Salt Wash is not exposed on or immediately adjacent to the claim, the distance of the logs above the base of the member cannot be determined.

On the Woodruff group south of the Yellow Nat several shallow pits have exposed roll-like mineralied bodies with some associated carbonaceous material. These bodies follow the bedding in general but cut across the bedding in places. One "roll" is 24 feet long and has a maximum thickness of about 6 inches. The other is almost 15 feet long with a maximum thickness of 1 foot. The pits are too shallow for a third dimension to be measured. Associated with the shorter "roll" are carbonaceous stringers as much as 1 foot long and 1½ inches thick and a carbonized log 1½ feet wide and 3 inches thick. The mineralized rock is dark brown fine-grained sandstone containing some yellow staining. The dark brown and yellow material impregnate the sandstone and are probably vanadium and uranium

(carnotite ?) minerals. In places the sandstone is impregnated and coated with a dark bluish mineral that is probably vanadium. Red ocherous material coats local spots. Sandstone above the "rolls" is limonite stained, and the sandstone below is relatively clean and white. Readings on a Scintillator (PRI Model 111) were a maximum of 0.85 Mr/hr and an average of 0.5 Mr/hr along the "rolls". According to the AEC geologist, a sample from one of the bodies assayed about 1.2 percent U_3O_8 and 5.0 percent V_2O_5.

These "rolls" apparently are at about the same stratigraphic position in the Salt Wash as the mineralized logs on the Yellow Nat claim. Gravel and rubble covering the slopes between the claims precludes the possibility of tracing beds between them.

The AEC geologist reports that log deposits on the Walters group about 3/4 mile north of the Yellow Nat assayed about 0.15 percent U_3O_8 and 12 to 15 percent $CaCO_3$.

According to the AEC geologist, it is not possible to determine sedimentary trends or channels through this area. Consequently, trends of the zone of "rolls" on the Woodruff group or of the mineralized logs on the Yellow Nat claim cannot be projected.

No "rolls" similar to those on the Woodruff group were observed on the Yellow Nat claim.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Exposed mineralized rock on the Yellow Nat claim is in three silicified logs about 32 and 44 feet above the lowest exposed beds in the Salt Wash member of the Morrison formation. Except along a gully at the east end of the claim, the bedrock is covered by gravel and slope wash. Small roll-like bodies have been prospected on the Woodruff group to the south, but no similar bodies were observed on the Yellow Nat.

The mineralized logs are too small for targets for core drilling. According to the Atomic Energy Commission geologist who worked in this area, sedimentary trends or channels, and, consequently, trends of zones of logs or "rolls" cannot be determined in this area. As a result, trends for locating drill sites or for drifting cannot be established. For these reasons, it is recommended that the application be denied.

Bulldozer stripping of the gravel and slope wash cover along the horizon of the logs might expose other mineralized logs that could be mined at the surface. Such logs, however, are expected to be so small and scattered that even this type of exploration does not seem practicable and is not recommended.

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

224 New Customhouse
Denver 2, Colorado

June 5, 1953.

Memorandum

To: Administrator, Defense Minerals Exploration Administration
Attention: Code 200

From: Executive Officer, DMEA Field Team, Region IV

Subject: Docketing for Exploration Assistance

Enclosed herewith in duplicate is DMA Form 3a and MF-103 and supporting data pertaining to the following applications for Government assistance in exploration work:

B & H Mining Company, Inc.
236 Brotherhood Bldg.
Kansas City, Kansas 3062

Darrel G. Hafen
712 South 11th East
Salt Lake City, Utah 3063

Mountain States Metals Co.
Box 851
Kingman, Arizona 3064

Nielson, Keele & Nielson
Blanding
Utah 3065

Timco, Inc.
c/o Karl Maxwell
1895 Carter Drive, Reno, Nevada 3066

Verne W. Young
Green River
Utah 3067

W. H. King
W. H. King

Enclosures

MF-103
(Revised April 1952)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION

Form Approved.
Budget Bureau No. 42-R1035.2.

APPLICATION FOR AID IN AN EXPLORATION PROJECT, PURSUANT TO DMEA ORDER 1, UNDER THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

Not to be filled in by applicant

Docket No. 3067
Metal or Mineral
Date Received 9/6/53
Estimated Cost
Participation (Government %)

INSTRUCTIONS

1. *Name of applicant.*—(*a*) State here your full legal name, in the form in which you will wish to contract, and your mailing address: Verne W. Young
Green River Utah

(*b*) If other than an individual, add to your name above whether a corporation, partnership, etc., and the name of the State in which incorporated or otherwise organized.

(*c*) If a corporation, add to above statement, titles, names and addresses of officers.

(*d*) If a partnership, add to the above statement the names and addresses of all partners.

2. *General.*—Read DMEA Order 1, "Government Aid in Defense Exploration Projects," before completing this application. Submit this application and all accompanying papers in quadruplicate (four copies), with your name and address on each sheet of the application and on all accompanying papers. Where sufficient space is not provided on the form for all required information, state it on an accompanying paper, with a reference in each case to the instruction to which it refers by number. Comply with all applicable instructions; or, if not applicable, so state. File the application with Defense Minerals Exploration Administration, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C., or with the nearest field executive officer thereof.

3. *Applicant's property rights.*—(*a*) State the legal description of the land upon which you wish to explore, including all land which you possess or control that may be benefited by the exploration, and excluding any land or interest in land which is not to be included in the exploration project contract Henry Mt. Mining District
Garfield Co. Unsurveyed. Claim No 42506
Recorded Book 14 Page 512

(*b*) State any mine name by which the property is known. Yellow Nat

(*c*) State your interest in the land, whether owner, lessee, purchaser under contract, or otherwise

(*d*) If you are not the owner, submit with this application a copy of the lease, contract, or other document under which you control the property.

(*e*) If you own the land, describe any liens or encumbrances on it None

(*f*) If the land consists of unpatented claims, add to the description above, the book and page numbers for each recorded location notice.

4. *Physical description.*—(*a*) Describe in detail any mining or exploration operations which have been or now are being conducted upon the land, including existing mine workings and production facilities. State your interest, if any, in such operations. Also describe accessibility of mine workings for examination purposes.

(*b*) State past and current production, and ore reserves, if any, giving quantities and grades.

(*c*) Describe the geologic features of the property, including mineralization, type of deposit (vein, bedded, etc.), and your reasons for wishing to explore. Illustrate with maps or sketches. Send with your application (but not necessarily as a part of it) any geologic or engineering report, assay maps, or other technologic information you may have, indicating on each whether you require its return to you.

(*d*) State the facts with respect to the accessibility of the project: Access roads, distances to shipping, supply and residence points.

(*e*) State the availability of manpower, materials, supplies, equipment, water, and power.

5. *The exploration project.*—(*a*) State the mineral or minerals for which you wish to explore Uranium

(*b*) Describe fully the proposed work, including a map or sketch of the property showing a plan (and cross sections if needed) of any present mine workings, and the location of the proposed exploration work as related to such features as contacts, veins, ore-bearing beds, etc.

(*c*) The work will start within 30 days and be completed within 6 months from the date of an exploration project contract.

(*d*) State the operating experience and background of the applicant with relation to the ability to carry out such exploration project, and also that of the person or persons who will supervise the operations.

6. *Estimate of costs.*—Furnish a detailed estimate of the costs of the proposed work (you will have to use a separate sheet), under the following headings. Add the totals under all headings to give the estimated total cost of the project:

(*a*) *Independent contracts.*—(Note.—If the applicant does not intend to let any of the work to contractors, write "none" after this item. To the extent that the work is to be contracted, do not repeat the cost of the contract-work in subsequent items.) State the cost of any proposed independent contracts for the performance of all or any part of the work, expressed in terms of units of work (such as per foot of drilling, per foot of drifting, per hour of bulldozer operations, per cubic yard of material moved, etc.).

(*b*) *Labor, supervision, consultants.*—Include an itemized schedule of numbers, classes and rates of wages, salaries or fees for necessary labor, supervision and engineering and geological consultants.

(*c*) *Operating materials and supplies.*—Furnish an itemized list, including items of equipment costing less than $50 each, and power, water and fuel.

(*d*) *Operating equipment.*—Furnish an itemized list of any operating equipment to be rented, purchased, or which is owned and will be furnished by the Operator, with the estimated rental, purchase price, or suggested use-allowance based on present value, as the case may be.

(*e*) *Rehabilitation and repairs.*—Furnish a detailed list showing the cost of any necessary initial rehabilitation or repairs of existing buildings, installations, fixtures, and movable operating equipment, now owned by the Operator and which will be devoted to the exploration project.

(*f*) *New buildings, improvements, installations.*—Furnish a detailed list showing the cost of any necessary buildings, fixed improvements, or installations to be purchased, installed or constructed for the benefit of the exploration project.

(*g*) *Miscellaneous.*—Furnish a detailed list showing the cost of repairs to and maintenance of operating equipment (not including initial rehabilitation or repairs of the Operator's equipment), analytical work, accounting, workmen's compensation and employers' liability insurance, and payroll taxes.

(*h*) *Contingencies.*—Give an estimate of any necessary allowances for contingencies not included in the costs stated above.

NOTE.—No items of general overhead, corporate management, interest, taxes (other than payroll and sales taxes), or any other indirect costs, or work performed or costs incurred before the date of the contract, should be included in the estimate of costs.

7. (*a*) Are you prepared to furnish your share of the cost of the proposed project in accordance with the regulations on Government participation (Sec. 7, DMEA No. 1)?

(*b*) How do you propose to furnish your share of the costs?

[X] Money [X] Use of equipment owned by you [ ] Other

Explain in detail on acompanying paper.

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned, whether as an individual, corporate officer, partner, or otherwise, both in his own behalf and acting for the applicant, certifies that the information set forth in this form and accompanying papers is correct and complete, to the best of his knowledge and belief.

Dated _____, 195__

Verne W. Young
(Applicant)

By _____

Title 18, U. S. Code (Crimes), Section 1001, makes it a criminal offense to make a willfully false statement or representation to any department or agency of the United States as to any matter within its jurisdiction.

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 16—66551-1

4 Physical Description: To the South about ¼ mile is a group of claims known as the Woodruff group. A shipment of ore was made by this group to Vitro in Salt Lake City . Returns showed Uranium 1.20% Vanidum 5.56% Lime .02%. To the north about ¾ mile are the Walters Claims showing .13% to .90% Uranium taken from surface samples on this group. I have a lease on two and one half of these claims. There is a very thick formation of morrison deposited here. On my claim, known as the "Yellow Nat" there is very little Morrison exposed near the contact point, however in the narrow exposure there are three visible trees, all have ore showing, with vein material showing in various places along face. The claim is easily accessible for examination.

(b) Claim has not been worked

(c) Morrison formation , about 500 ft. thick , a nd all in tact from the Summerville at the lower strata to the Dakota above the Morrison .Both tree and vein bedding . Both uranium and vanadium present.

With the indications that are present in the small amount of exposed Mo Morrison I have been advised by A. E. C. engineers and experienced Uranium miners that there is a probability of the claim being very good. and potentially a large deposit held in place by the gravel banks that completely cover the unexposed portion of the Morrison. Am enclosing one face sample assay report. The Woodruff claims have a very similar condition as to formation veins trees and beddings. They are producing high grade ore , and we are on the same contact level.

Map





(d) Ore has been shipped from Woodruff and Walters Claims . Some road work would be necessary before a hauling truck could reach the Yellow Nat The A. E. C. had a field camp set up about ½mile west of claims. A jeep can get to the Yellow Nat.

Shipping distance about 138mi. When buying station is opened in Green River the shipping distance will be 103 mi. Closest supply point is Hanksville, Utah 40 mi. from claim. I would expect to set up camp about ½ mi. from claim.

(e) Manpower is plentiful as are materials, supplies etc. No power, plenty of water.

5

(b) Strip face down to Morrison formation following contact. 2000ft. core drilling, 600 ft. of tunnel.



(d) I will contract tunnel work to Howard Staker of Huntington Utah. Mr. Staker has equipment and has had ten continuous years of uranium mining experience. He is a graduate civil engineer and a reliable person.

Core drilling to Majors Drilling Co. 502 Alta Bldg. Salt Lake City. Would hire Lavar Brown of Hanksville, Utah for face stripping and road work.

Applicant has had 15 years sub contracting and construction experience Three years uranium prospecting.

5

(a)	Cat work 12 days @ $64	$768
	Core Drilling 2000ft, @ $ 4.00	8000
	Tunnels 600ft. @ $10.00	6000

(B) Contractors would hire own men. I would need a consulting engineer, but not all the time, A. E. C. might furnish same.

(c)	To be furnished by contractors.	
(d)	Geiger Counter	$430
(e)	Pickup Truck And Dump Truck (Furnished by owner)	$7100*
(f)	Buildings for living quarters bunk house etc.	$1100
(G)	Assaying	500
(h)	Owners supervision $20.00per day.	2400
	(Included in above wife will cook and clean camp.)	
	Total	$19,248

Trucks furnished by owner not included in above *

It may be necessary to employ an accountant

7 (b)

I own a 1953 International L 18c Dump Truck which I would use to haul sample loads of ore during the time that work was being carried on. I would drive the truck my self when I was not busy with supervision of the work. I would also use this truck in building road etc. whenever it could be profitably used. The truck is worth approximately $ 5000 .

It will be necessary for me to purchase a pickup truck which I would expect to get for around $2100. This truck I would use to bring supplies to the camp, take ore samples in for assay, haul materials for building camp. If possible I should like what ever portion of my share of the cost that can be met by use of these trucks, the remainder of my share would be met by cash.