REPORT OF MINERAL EXAMINATION

Claimants: J. F. McKee Verified Statements
Edith M. McKee Oregon-06008-A
Homer McKee (Union "A" Area)
Carol McKee Oregon-011693-C
Ralph McKee (Union "C" Area)
Mary McKee (by J. F. McKee, their attorney in fact.)

Box 622
North Bend, Oregon


Subject: Validity of mining claims.

Lands Involved: Two 160-acre placer claims known as the Crater Lake Nos. 88 and 89, shown on Verified Statement Oregon-06008-A and four 160-acre association placer claims known as Crater Lake Nos. 15, 16, 17, and 18, shown on Verified Statement Oregon-011693-C, located in sec. 5, T. 31 S., R. 3 E., W.M., and sec. 4, T. 32 S., R. 3 E., W.M., respectively, within the Rogue River National Forest, Jackson County, Oregon.

Land Status: National Forest land open to mineral entry.

Location Data: Crater Lake Nos. 88 and 89 located July 15, 1950, and recorded in Book 53, pages 361 and 363, described as SE¼ and SW¼ of sec. 5, T. 31 S., R. 3 E., respectively. Crater Lake placer claims Nos. 15, 16, 17, and 18, located June 14, 1950, recorded in Book 53, pages 199 through 206, described as the NW¼, SE¼, SW¼, and NE¼ of sec. 4, T. 32 S., R. 3 E., respectively.
Mining District: None known
Mining Engineer and Milvoy M. Suchy
Dates of Examination: August 18, 19, 20, and 21, 1963
Accompanied by: No one.
The six mining claims covered by this report are located in two different areas that were published under Public Law 167, 84th Congress. The claims are located some 55 miles northeast of Medford, Oregon, within the Rogue River National Forest. The claims occupy a flat of minor relief and contain valuable stands of commercial timber, mostly ponderosa pine with some intermixed Douglas-fir. This area is used as a winter logging show and is important to the economy of the Medford area. The basement rocks in the area are metasedimentary and metavolcanic rocks which have been covered by volcanic flows and volcanic ejecta. The nearest known mineralized area is the Buzzard or Al Sarena mine which is located some 8 miles west of the claims. There has been no activity at this mine since the early 1940's.

The six claims which are the subject of this report are part of some 600 claims that have been staked in the area since the 1940's by five principal mining claimants. Most of the other claims have gone to hearings and have been declared invalid by the Department of the Interior. Mr. J. F. McKee submitted two verified statements containing some 290 claims. All but the subject six claims were rejected by the Land Office on the basis that they had proceeded to a hearing and had been declared invalid or were outside the areas which were being published.

A reconnaissance was made of all the area within the six subject mining claims, and sample points were picked which would be representative of the materials present within the claims. The samples were taken from depths of from 4 to 7 feet below the surface so that they would represent an appreciable amount of the material present. The samples in all cases were two-thirds of a cubic foot and were panned to a concentrate which was saved for analysis. The analysis consisted of separating out and weighing the magnetic fraction within the concentrate and recombinating the material and sending it for assay to Black and Deason of Salt Lake City, Utah. The assay results show that no gold, silver, or platinum is present in any of the six claims, and that the concentrates contained up to almost 20 percent titanium oxide. The data was tabulated in regard to magnetite, titanium oxide, and concentrates and was converted to amounts present per ton of material in place. Based on the ilmenite or titanium oxide content and the magnetite, the maximum indicated value is approximately 10 cents per ton. There is no known applicable placering operation that could even concentrate these two fractions for that cost.

It is concluded that the material within the six claims contains the usual accessory minerals in quantities that are commonly present in these types of deposits. Consequently, it is believed that a discovery of a valuable mineral deposit is not present within any of the six claims and that the claims are invalid.
Location and Topography

The subject claims are located northeast of Medford, Oregon, in the vicinity of the Union Creek Ranger Station. The claims are accessible from Medford, Oregon, by way of State Highway No. 62 through Prospect, a total distance of some 51 miles and 56 miles, respectively, to the turnoffs onto unsurfaced roads to the claims. The claims lie approximately a mile off of State Highway No. 62.

The area in general is a plateau and is known locally as Prospect Flat. The plateau has local knolls and swales which are due, in part, to the irregularities in the underlying lava flows and, in part, to the water action on the overlying, unconsolidated materials.

Surface Values

Prospect Flat, upon which the subject claims are located, supports a good stand of merchantable timber, mostly ponderosa pine with some fir. This area has been a winter logging show for many years and is closely tied into the economy of the Medford area.

The recreational potential of the Prospect Flat area is quite high and is presently enjoying usage for camping, hiking, fishing, and picnicking. In addition, a church group has a summer camp in the area, and a resort is in operation at Union Creek. The Flat is traversed by the Rogue River and several streams, all of which offer good fishing.

Watershed values are high because of the nature of the unconsolidated material covering the basement rocks. The overlying material is composed of volcanic debris and gravels and provides a large storage reservoir for surface waters.

Areal and Economic Geology

The basement rocks of the area appear as fault escarpments along the Rogue River and are mostly metasedimentary and metavolcanic formations. These are overlaid by both extrusives and eruptives, in this order: lava flows, volcanic ash, pumice, and ash. The lava flows, as well as the eruptive material, are associated with Mount Mazama which through volcanic evolution formed Crater Lake. Flood plains cover large areas, as evidenced by later deposits of sand and gravel intermingled with eruptive materials.

The only mine in the area with a production record is the Buzzard or Al Sarena mine, located some 7 or 8 miles west of the subject claims. Records show that the Buzzard mine produced something over a thousand ounces of gold in the period of 1909 to 1918. During the 1930's and again sometime in the forties, some effort was made to work the sulfide
zones that were exposed with depth; however, only a pilot-scale production resulted. The mineralization is present in the form of fissure fillings that were deposited within Tertiary rocks. The mineralization is believed to be associated with dioritic intrusives of around Miocene age. There does not appear to be any interest in the mineralization in the Al Sarena mine at the present time.

Pertinent Information

Claim-staking in the general area of Prospect Flat began in the early 1940's. Examinations of claims were made by Government mining engineers as early as 1944; however, no claims were brought to an actual contest until in the middle 1950's. Up to the time of the actual hearings in the middle 1950's, some 600 claims had been located by five groups of claimants, including the group headed by Mr. J. F. McKee. The claims that posed any administrative problem in the Prospect Flat area were brought to hearings in the 1950's, and it was believed that all of the claims of the various claimants were contested at that time. In every case, the final decisions declared the claims to be null and void for lack of a discovery of a valuable mineral deposit. The area was published under the provisions of Public Law 167, 84th Congress, to determine the surface rights in the Prospect Flat area. The search and subsequent publications of notice in the local newspaper took place during the 1950's and early 1960's. As a result, Mr. J. F. McKee submitted verified statements covering all of the claims he had originally staked on Prospect Flat. Prospect Flat was published in two areas - Union "A" and Union "C". Mr. McKee submitted a verified statement for the Union "A" Area for 131 claims and for Union "C", 159 claims. Most of the claims in the Union "A" Area were also included in his verified statement on the Union "C" Area. Two Land Office decisions, dated March 23, 1962 (06008-A), and February 13, 1963 (011693-C), rejected all but six of the claims, either as having been declared invalid previously or as lying outside of the published areas. The six claims which were not rejected are the subject of this report of mineral examination.

Discovery

During 1953 and 1954, I made numerous examinations of mining claims on Prospect Flat. The findings of these examinations resulted in subsequent hearings and eventually in decisions that declared in every case that the mining claims were invalid for lack of a discovery of a valuable mineral deposit. During those years, I took over 50 samples from mining claims and panned them to concentrates of black sand. In addition, the examination made in 1963 resulted in seven more samples of concentrate, making the total samples that have been panned to
concentrates well over 60. In no case did I find any color in the black sand. In all instances the sample concentrates were sent for assay for gold and silver and in some cases for platinum and titanium oxide. Results disclosed that in only one case was a trace of gold present and that, in three instances, traces of silver were found. Titanium was present in the concentrates to a maximum concentration of 19.2 percent. The magnetic fractions, which were primarily magnetite, were separated and found to make up most of the concentrate itself. The elements and oxides for which these claims were tested and assayed are the ones that Mr. McKee stated were the basis of his locations.

The appended Maps A and B together show the location of the claims, the samples that were taken, and some of the topographic and cultural features.

The six claims were examined by traversing them in strips. In general, it was found that the areas away from the drainages were composed of pumice and volcanic ash and that the areas along the drainages were composed of flood sands and gravel. Clay was found to predominate in the Crater Lake No. 88 claim. The seven samples that were taken and panned to a concentrate represent the predominant types of material found within the six claims. Reference is made to the appended Table, which shows the assay results of the concentrates and the titanium oxide, magnetite, and concentrates on a pounds per ton of material in place basis. All of the samples were taken on cut banks or from dug pits or post holes so that the samples would represent appreciable depths of material. These depths varied from 4 feet to a maximum of 11 feet.

Samples CL #1 and CL #3 were taken of a mixture of lump pumice, fine ash, and pumicite to a maximum depth of 7 feet. As shown on the tabulation, these two samples contained a very small amount of black sand.

Samples CL #2 and CL #4 represent water-washed sand and gravel to a maximum depth of 4½ feet. The tabulation shows that these samples contained the largest amounts of black sand according to the concentrate of any of the seven samples.

Sample CL #5 was taken of a mixture of water-washed material at and near the surface along Woodruff Creek (see Map B) and contained a very small amount of black sand. This was probably due to the position of the gravel sampled.

Samples CL #6 and CL #7 represent clay material that is exposed in the road cuts, and the tabulation shows very little black sand is present.
Sample CL #4 contains the greatest mineral values, as 1.9 pounds of titanium oxide and 15.9 pounds of magnetite are present for each ton of material in place.

At the bottom of the tabulation are noted the prices for titanium and iron ore. Using these market values, the indicated value of Sample CL #4 per ton is about 10 cents per ton. I do not know of any applicable placer mining method that could even recover the magnetite and ilmenite present for 10 cents a yard. Consequently, although the ilmenite present (which contains the titanium oxide) and the magnetite present (which is the iron ore) could be concentrated to a saleable product, the amount present in the original material would make such an effort uneconomical and a sham.

Conclusions

It is concluded that the six mining claims which are the subject of this report do not contain any precious mineralization and contain only the nominal accessory minerals that commonly occur in these types of deposits. It is concluded that a discovery of a valuable mineral deposit does not exist within the boundaries of any of the claims and that the claims are invalid.

Date 5/5/65

MILVOY M. SUCHY, Mining Engineer

Approved:

Date 5/5/65

Acting Assistant Regional Forester
# Table of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample No</th>
<th>Assay Results of Concentrates</th>
<th>Amount Present Per Ton of Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL#1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>8.68% 1.96 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL#2</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
<td>16.00 lbs. 0.96 lbs. 18.30 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL#3</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>2.25 lbs. 0.28 lbs. 3.48 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL#4</td>
<td>10.34%</td>
<td>15.90 lbs. 1.90 lbs. 18.30 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL#5</td>
<td>9.25%</td>
<td>1.90 lbs. 0.30 lbs. 3.28 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL#6</td>
<td>19.20%</td>
<td>1.02 lbs. 0.31 lbs. 1.62 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL#7</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>0.82 lbs. 0.02 lbs. 0.90 lbs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All samples were \( \frac{2}{3} \) of a cull, and were panned to a concentrate.

Market value \( TiO_2 \) — Engineering \( Mining \) Journal of Mar. 29 '65
Ilmenite - 59.5% \( TiO_2 \) - $25-$26- per long ton Atlantic Ports (\$/#)  
Iron Ore (60% Iron Min.) is presently being delivered to Long Beach, Calif. for export at a price of $10.20 per ton (\$/#)