

Division of Geological Survey  
**MINES BULLETIN**



VOL. XX

MARCH 1972

No. 3

P. O. Box 80007

College, Alaska 99701

Published to Accelerate the Development of the Mining Industry in Alaska  
William A. Egan - Governor Charles F. Herbert - Commissioner  
William C. Fackler - Assistant Commissioner for Minerals

**IN THIS ISSUE**

MACLAREN RIVER GEOCHEM

NEW AEROMAGNETIC MAPS

ANNUAL REPORT

NEW USGS REPORTS

MINERS AND CONSERVATIONISTS

KLUKWAN ORE AGREEMENT

METAL MARKET

POSSIBLE WITHDRAWALS

PROPOSED MINING LAW

OBJECTION TO USGS

SILVER

GOLD

LEAD

MACLAREN RIVER GEOCHEM RESULTS AVAILABLE

A short paper summarizing results of geochemical sampling in south-central Alaska during 1971 will soon be available for public distribution, it was announced by William C. Fackler, Assistant Commissioner for Minerals. Entitled "Preliminary results of stream sediment sampling, Upper Maclaren River Area, South-Central Alaska", this paper, prepared by Thomas E. Smith, Thomas C. Tribble, and Donald R. Stein, discusses a drainage area anomalously high in stream-sediment copper.

A limited number of free copies will be available on request Monday, April 3 at the following places and local times:

Fairbanks: 9:00 am College Office  
Division of Geological Survey, Box 80007,  
College, Alaska 99701  
University Maintenance Bldg.  
Corner, University Avenue and College Rd.  
4 miles west of Fairbanks

Anchorage: 9:00 am Anchorage Office  
Division of Geological Survey  
323 E. Fourth Avenue  
Anchorage, Alaska

Juneau: 11:00 am Juneau Office  
Division of Geological Survey  
509 Goldstein Bldg.  
Juneau, Alaska

Ketchikan: 11:00 am Ketchikan Office  
Division of Geological Survey  
National Bank of Alaska Bldg.  
Ketchikan, Alaska

AEROMAGNETIC MAPS OF GOODNEWS-PLATINUM, SEWARD  
AND EAST ALASKA RANGE AREAS

Fifty-three aeromagnetic maps of the Goodnews-Platinum area will be put on sale on March 15th.

The maps are the result of a project mapping 42,000 square miles, which includes 149 other maps of the East Alaska Range and the Seward Peninsula published earlier this year.

The maps show contour lines of magnetic field intensity. The fluxgate magnetometer signal was recorded in flight on a paper strip chart recorder. The survey flight lines were spaced 3/4 mile apart and 1000 feet above ground level where possible. The maps generally show the concentration of magnetite in the rocks and are useful indicators of the boundaries of different rock types.

The maps are priced at \$1.05 each, postpaid, and are available from the Alaska Division of Geological Survey, Box 80007, College, Alaska, or from Division offices in Anchorage, Juneau, or Ketchikan.

1971 ANNUAL REPORT

The Division of Geological Survey's 1971 Annual Report will soon be available to anyone interested in geology and mining in Alaska.

Publication of the report is expected in April, and will contain, not only summaries of Alaska Geological Survey Projects, but also sections giving information about mining production, prospecting and exploration throughout the state. The report also lists recent publications in geology and mining that are available from other government agencies such as the U.S. Geological Survey and the U.S. Bureau of Mines. Requests for the report should be sent to Division of Geological Survey, Box 80007, College, Alaska, 99701.

NEW OPEN-FILE RELEASES - SEWARD PENINSULA AND  
SW NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE

The U.S. Geological Survey has released on open file the following reports:

Sainsbury, C. L.; Hudson, Travis; Ewing, Rodney; Marsh, W. R., Reconnaissance geologic map of the Nome C-2 quadrangle, Seward Peninsula, Alaska, 13 p., 1 sheet (scale 1:63,360).

U.S. Geological Survey, Aeromagnetic data from S.W. Naval Petroleum Reserve, Alaska, 4 sheets (3 at scale 1:250,000; 1 at 1:63,360).

These reports can be seen in the following listed Alaskan offices of the USGS and also at offices of the Alaska Division of Geological Survey.

U. S. Geological Survey:	402 Brooks Building, College
	108 Skyline Building, Anchorage
	441 Federal Building, Juneau

Copies can be purchased only at the Alaskan Mineral Resources Branch, USGS, 345 Middlefield Road, Menlo Park, California 94025.

## MINERS CHAT WITH CONSERVATIONISTS

By Jim Kowalsky, Director Fairbanks Environmental Center  
(From Fairbanks Daily News Miner, Feb. 1, 1972)

"It was almost a summit meeting except we were in the basement of the University of Alaska's student center. It had the casting of some historic battle except the drama ended up to be a cordial, heart-to-heart talk.

- There were considerable differences of view with little reconciliation, but the miners and the conservationists sat down and dug deeply together.

Some pretty knowledgeable spokesman for the industry, Ed Chipp and Jeff Knaebel of Resource Associates of Alaska, were among us to help explore some problems of mining and wilderness, two items which seem to be at the opposite ends of the resource spectrum.

The idea was to bring together a small group who could talk about mining and wilderness conflicts in Alaska and decide whether these are insurmountable, or whether they even exist. They do, but there might be a few surprises.

To help draw together the ideas of the evening were Bob Weeden of the University's Department of Wildlife Management, Don Grybeck and Tom Hamilton of the University's Geology Department along with Wyatt Gilbert who planned the occasion, and Gordon Wright of the Fairbanks Group of the Sierra Club. Cleland Conwell and Tom Smith of the State Geological Survey were on hand to help answer questions.

Since so much of Alaska is still in some relatively wild state, there are those who view that potential. Some wildlands - or wilderness - along with those things which live and grow on it could be considered as a resource and managed in that way.

Then the Alaska minerals industry views its resource potential with concern for healthy growth. There is hardly an easy road ahead for the miners, as Jeff especially emphasized.

Barriers and myths about mines and wilderness came down and we started to unearth some facts. We saw that sometimes, but certainly not always, mines and wilderness get in each others' way. Ed felt that mineralized lands can be identified rather accurately but never completely so. He thinks that this situation makes necessary a flexible planning mechanism so that errors of judgment on all sides of the question - minerals and wildlands - can be accommodated.

Perhaps there is some need for good land-planning. Maybe it has to be flexible too. The point came out over and over that, if too many conflicts arise without sound solutions sought in an atmosphere of good knowledge and faith, then big government steps into that ready-made situation and makes a few administrative choices for us.

Jeff pointed out that the industry must have freeness in order to continue the creative process. He takes great exception to the sweeping discretionary powers which result in heavy-handed administrative actions, and which he feels will kill the initiative of the free enterprise system which supports the lifestyles of most Americans (we didn't talk about the excesses which help to create these demands; I hope we do).

Bureaucratic empire building is something a lot of people fear. I guess the mining people do and the wilderness people don't, and perhaps there is a reason. Wilderness isn't private enterprise stuff.

Some states such as Tennessee have a state wilderness system. However, wilderness protection systems exist - or have the potential to exist - upon federal lands in most places. There is such an overall plan or system, and it is called the National Wilderness System. The vehicle for this system is the Wilderness Act, enacted by Congress in 1964. The National Wilderness System lands are managed by law by three federal agencies, the National Park Service, the U.S. Forest Service, and the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. So it is not difficult to see why those people who want to see additions to the National Wilderness System naturally have some interests in those administrative agencies of the federal government.

In any case, Bob Weeden felt that the attitudes toward government as such is the largest point of disagreement. He spoke to the point that a government's regulatory role in questions of resource management is to protect public values, not to abuse them, and he wanted to know to whom if not the government should the regulatory powers for Alaska mining go. Tom Hamilton states that, since federal programs are with us, it is necessary to understand what it is these programs are trying to accomplish.

Ed Chipp felt that the industry itself, rather than government, should be willing to do the job. I guess this means that the good guys would turn in the bad guys. I am reminded of a recent Fairbanks meeting of the Alaska Professional Hunters Association. The guides are angry at the abuses of those

within their profession and are now anxious to help prosecute where regulatory violations occur. These abuses are resulting in part to a public pressure nationally which is growing toward some anti-hunting legislation measures now before the Congress.

So there are threats to the industry - subtle and otherwise - but where are the threats to the wilderness?

We probed around for a spell on this. Encroaching populations and their technology were mentioned. Bob cited as an example the fact that, despite popular opinion to the contrary, the most recent census figures demonstrate a population increase in the bush. He said that the problem here is that Alaska is thought to be too large to pay any attention to zoning. He feels that human activity and its works should fit the land which will support it best. And he doesn't seem very confident that in every case are all manner of Alaskans going their separate ways able to cope with the decisions.

Nothing earthshaking was uncovered, but the miners and conservationists did sit down and talk. The tone, cordial and in earnest, the information flow, excellent.

We did discover that it is likely that mineralized lands may not conflict with those which have wilderness potential. And we found that, with 52,000 acres placed into the National Wilderness System in Alaska so far, only about 29 million acres of a possible 49 million acres will likely ever even be proposed for inclusion within the system. Where will the conflicts likely be?

Another such exchange was agreed to. Miners and conservationists may never see eye-to-eye on

lot of things, but at least on the question of the industry and the wilderness classification system, there may be some clearing of the air.

It can really surprise one how the murky fog of ignorance can lift when it is exposed to the warming rays of a good heart-

to-heart. Sitting down and talking to each other - how much mistrust and wrongdoing can result when this process is lost or forgotten. The interrelationships of the human environment got mixed well into those of the natural the other evening. From an ecological standpoint that's a pretty sound process."

### MITSUBISHI-KLUKWAN ORE AGREEMENT

"A consent agreement between the Mitsubishi Corp. and the Klukwan Village Council has been signed, giving the Japanese firm the right to develop the deposits of low-grade iron ore in the Klukwan area. A feasibility study recently completed by the Henry J. Kaiser Co. reported that the deposit can be developed successfully, using an oil-fired power plant. Kaiser engineers plan a plant which would produce 600,000 tpy of pellets averaging 68% iron. The development is estimated to cost \$123 million and would employ 900 men. It is estimated that the alluvial fan contains at least 800 million tons of ore, and would provide 20 years of operation." (Engineering and Mining Journal, 1-72).

METAL MARKET			
Metals	February 28, 1972	Month Ago	Year Ago
Antimony ore, stu equivalent European ore	\$8.64-10.00	\$8.54-9.92	\$11.61-14.29
Barite (drilling mud grade per ton)	\$18-22	\$18-22	\$12-16
Beryllium powder, 98%, per lb.	\$54-66	\$54-66	\$54-66
Chrome ore per long ton	\$25-27	\$25-27	\$25.55
Copper per lb.	52.5¢	52.3¢	50.3¢
Gold per oz.	\$48.94	\$46.25	\$39.15
Lead per lb.	14.5¢	14.0¢	13.5¢
Mercury per 76# flask	\$212	\$215-225	\$348-355
Molybdenum conc., per lb.	\$1.72	\$1.72	\$1.72
Nickel per lb.	\$1.33	\$1.33	\$1.33
Platinum per oz.	\$102-105	\$110-120	\$105-125
Silver, New York, per oz.	148.42	149.9¢	161¢
Tin per lb.	171.6¢	171.6¢	163.6¢
Titanium ore per ton (Ilmenite)	\$30-35	\$30-35	\$30-35
Tungsten per unit	\$55.00	\$55.00	\$55.00
Zinc per lb.	17.0¢	17.0¢	15.0¢

## NEW LAND WITHDRAWALS PROBABLE IN TONGASS AND CHUGACH FORESTS

Each region of the U.S. Forest Service is presently engaged in a study of National Forest land-areas of 5000 acres or more which are without roads and are unclassified for use. The Forest Service plans to utilize public involvement, and on June 30th, 1972, each region will submit certain proposed wilderness areas to the Chief of the Forest Service for further study.

In Alaska, it is likely that more areas of the Tongass and Chugach National Forests will be withdrawn from mineral entry, until final decisions are made in Washington by October or November.

In Washington on March 9th, officials of the Forest Service held a briefing on this "roadless areas study" for representatives of the mining industry.

The American Mining Congress' Public Land Subcommittee on National Forest Mining Regulations has been following this matter. A report of the briefing is available to all companies interested in public land matters from:

H. Stanley Dempsey, Chairman  
Public Lands Subcommittee on National Forest  
Mining Regulations  
American Mining Congress  
1100 Ring Building  
Washington, D. C. 20036.

### PROPOSED NEW MINING LAW

(From an editorial, Mining Congress Journal, Oct. 1971)

"Senators Bible, Allott and Moss have introduced S. 2542 and Congressmen Aspinall and McClure have introduced H.R. 10640, identical legislation to establish a system for the development of mineral resources on public lands of the United States.

Known as the 'Mineral Development Act of 1971,' this proposal is vigorously supported by the American mining industry as a 20th Century replacement for the Mining Act of 1872. It is an alternative to proposals which call for the establishment of a mineral leasing system for minerals now subject to the 1872 mining law.

The Mineral Development Act of 1971 deals with the problems which have been identified in the operation of the 1872 law while preserving the dynamic elements of that law which have served the country well for so many years. This proposed legislation would, among other things,

Provide for the orderly elimination of existing unpatented mining claims from the public lands, many of them long since abandoned.

Require that all patented and unpatented claims be recorded with the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior.

Substantially increase annual labor requirements as well as the purchase price for lands covered by a mineral patent.

Provide for the payment of a royalty on the mine value of the minerals mined.

Eliminate the provisions of existing law which permit the states to impose requirements for location and maintenance of mining claims, thus eliminating unnecessary abuse of the surface of the land.

Provide that patent for a mining claim could be obtained by either proof of the discovery of "valuable mineral deposits" as defined in the bill, or by filing a plan of development with the Secretary of the Interior that is approved by the Secretary, provided that equipment and facilities are acquired and installed in compliance with the plan.

Land used for prospecting or mining would be subject to the applicable laws and regulations designed to protect the environment. (The American Mining Congress is supporting the promulgation of federal regulations and the enactment of laws of general application in this field.)

These and other provisions of the Mineral Development Act of 1971 closely follow the recommendations of the Public Land Law Review Commission. The provisions of this legislation were closely studied by leading experts in the field of mining and mineral law. The mining industry heartily supports this measure.

Now is the time to bring your views on this important legislation to the attention of your Senators and Representatives."

#### AMC OBJECTS TO USGS PROCEDURES

"The American Mining Congress has objected to proposed new procedures of the U. S. Geological Survey for processing permits for exploratory drilling and mining plans on federal lands.

The 'Federal Register' of Nov. 19, 1971, provided for delay in approval of (1) applications for permits to drill exploratory oil and gas or geothermal steam wells and (2) original mining plans and major mining plan changes.

This proposal stated that such applications will not be approved by the USGS until after a notice of such application is posted for "at least 30 days" during which the public may submit comments and suggestions.

The District Engineer or Supervisor will determine whether approval of the proposed operations would constitute a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the environment. If he so determines, approval of the application will be further delayed while an environmental impact statement is prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

These procedures were to have become effective Jan. 1, 1972, but were postponed for 90 days. Comments were invited. The 'Federal Register' of Jan. 7 contained procedures to be followed by USGS in the preparation of environmental statements.

In a letter to the USGS, W. Howard Gray, chairman of the AMC Public Lands Committee, stated that "requiring the preparation of such a statement for permit to drill or to proceed with a mining plan goes far beyond the intent and scope of the National Environmental Policy Act. Certainly these are not 'major federal actions.' The result of such an interpretation will inevitably bring the administrative processes of the Geological Survey relating to mining application to a halt." Gray told USGS that "such a procedure is totally unnecessary since there are already regulations in force to insure environmental protection." (Western Mining News, Feb. 11, 1972)

#### SILVER

"One of the best authorities states that silver will continue its upward trend to about \$1.60 per ounce, consolidate at that figure for awhile, and then proceed to about \$2 to \$2.10 an ounce by approximately June 1. . . A New York silver market letter reported a general mood of bullishness in both the silver bullion and silver coins markets. . . A statistical report on the silver market, published in New York, said government figures on declining domestic consumption are erroneous and that consumption has been rising steadily for the last seven years. Also, the cumulative supply surplus was slashed about one-third during 1971. . . Congressman McClure of Idaho said silver could be the base for 14 medals to be minted commemorating the 200th anniversary of American independence. . . Another eastern service says: "We think investors should have more confidence in silver than the market demonstrates." New uses such as water purification, hurricane prevention, non-glare glass, etc. will add a demand already 50 per cent above new mine output. . . The New York price of silver has advanced from \$1.38 to \$1.52 since the first of the year." (Western Mining News, Feb. 11, 1972)

#### GOLD

"The New York price of gold reached a new all-time high of \$49.55 per ounce during the week, before profit-taking set in. Gold dealers said the sharp rise resulted from a near absence of sellers. Buyers were said to have been attracted due to growing doubts about the health of the American economy. Dollar sales rose and the dollar fell to its lowest levels since December's devaluation. . . In Denver, Sen. Gordon Allott, Chairman of the Senate Policy Committee announced at the Western Mining Conference there that he would introduce legislation to allow private individuals to own gold. He said he would introduce it as a separate bill, not an amendment, saying it would be a hedge against inflation and stimulate gold mining." (Western Mining News, Feb. 11, 1972)

#### LEAD

"Major producers of lead raised the price 1/2 cent per pound to 14 1/2 cents. An official of St. Joe Minerals said the lead business was good, especially batteries, and he doesn't look for a decrease in lead in gasoline. ASARCO said the move was necessary to compete for lead concentrates. Domestic inventories are being depleted while demand is increasing. The price increase did not need Price Commission approval since lead is still selling below the level of last May 25, one of the Phase 2 base dates." (Western Mining News, Feb. 11, 1972)