



CONTACT INFORMATION

Mining Records Curator
Arizona Geological Survey
1520 West Adams St.
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-771-1601
<http://www.azgs.az.gov>
inquiries@azgs.az.gov

The following file is part of the

Arizona Department of Mines and Mineral Resources Mining Collection

ACCESS STATEMENT

These digitized collections are accessible for purposes of education and research. We have indicated what we know about copyright and rights of privacy, publicity, or trademark. Due to the nature of archival collections, we are not always able to identify this information. We are eager to hear from any rights owners, so that we may obtain accurate information. Upon request, we will remove material from public view while we address a rights issue.

CONSTRAINTS STATEMENT

The Arizona Geological Survey does not claim to control all rights for all materials in its collection. These rights include, but are not limited to: copyright, privacy rights, and cultural protection rights. The User hereby assumes all responsibility for obtaining any rights to use the material in excess of "fair use."

The Survey makes no intellectual property claims to the products created by individual authors in the manuscript collections, except when the author deeded those rights to the Survey or when those authors were employed by the State of Arizona and created intellectual products as a function of their official duties. The Survey does maintain property rights to the physical and digital representations of the works.

QUALITY STATEMENT

The Arizona Geological Survey is not responsible for the accuracy of the records, information, or opinions that may be contained in the files. The Survey collects, catalogs, and archives data on mineral properties regardless of its views of the veracity or accuracy of those data.

06/12/86

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND MINERAL RESOURCES FILE DATA

PRIMARY NAME: PAULDEN ROCK AND SAND

ALTERNATE NAMES:

DUNBAR STONE PIT

YAVAPAI COUNTY MILS NUMBER: 1341

LOCATION: TOWNSHIP 18 N RANGE 2 W SECTION 35 QUARTER W2
LATITUDE: N 34DEG 53MIN 59SEC LONGITUDE: W 112DEG 26MIN 43SEC
TOPO MAP NAME: PAULDEN - 15 MIN

CURRENT STATUS: PRODUCER

COMMODITY:

SAND & GRAVEL

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

OP: DUNBAR STONE CO. INC.
BUR. MINES INFO.
ADMMR PAULDEN ROCK & SAND FILE

ABSTRACTED FROM ADMMR ACTIVE MINES DIRECTORY, 1992

*Paulden Rock & Sand file
Yavapai County*

DUNBAR STONE COMPANY

Dunbar Stone Plant T21N R2W Sec. 3

P.O. Box 246, Ash Fork, AZ 86320 - 901 Lewis - Phone 637-2592 - Employees:
63 - Quarries in Coconino, Maricopa, Mohave, and Yavapai Counties - Flagstone,
marble and schist - Stone processing plant in Ashfork - Marketed in and out of
state.

President G. E. Dunbar
Vice President W. B. Dunbar
Maintenance Superintendent Ron Dunbar
General Manager Witt Randall

ABSTRACTED FROM ADMMR ACTIVE MINES DIRECTORY, 1991

DUNBAR STONE COMPANY

Dunbar Stone Plant T21N R2W Sec. 3

P.O. Box 246, Ash Fork, AZ 86320 - 901 Lewis - Phone 637-2592 - Employees:
63 - Quarries in Coconino, Maricopa, Mohave, and Yavapai Counties
- Flagstone, marble and schist - Stone processing plant in Ashfork
- Marketed in and out of state.

President
G.E. Dunbar
Vice President W.B.
Dunbar
Maintenance Superintendent Ron Dunbar

ABSTRACTED FROM ADMMR ACTIVE MINES DIRECTORY, 1990

DUNBAR STONE COMPANY

Dunbar Stone Plant T21N R2W Sec. 3

P.O. Box 246, Ash Fork, AZ 86320 - 901 Lewis - Phone 637-2592 - Employees:
63 - Quarries in Coconino, Maricopa, Mohave, and Yavapai Counties
- Flagstone, marble and schist - Stone processing plant in Ashfork
- Marketed in and out of state.

President G.E. Dunbar
Vice President W.B. Dunbar
Maintenance Superintendent Ron Dunbar

ABSTRACTED FROM ADMMR ACTIVE MINES DIRECTORY, 1989

DUNBAR STONE COMPANY

Dunbar Stone Plant

T21N R2W Sec. 3

P.O. Box 246, Ash Fork 86320 - 901 Lewis - Phone 637-2592 - Employees 63 - Quarries in Coconino, Maricopa, Mohave, and Yavapai Counties - Flagstone, marble and schist - Stone processing plant in Ashfork - Marketed in and out of state.

President	G.E. Dunbar
Vice President	W.B. Dunbar
Maintenance Superintendent	Ron Dunbar

ABSTRACTED FROM ADMMR ACTIVE MINES DIRECTORY, 1988

DUNBAR STONE COMPANY

**Dunbar Stone Plant
Quarries**

T21N R2W Sec. 3

P.O. Box 246, Ash Fork 86320 - 901 Lewis - Phone 637-2592 - Employees 31 -
Quarries in Coconino, Maricopa, Mohave, and Yavapai Counties - Flagstone,
marble and schist - Stone processing plant in Ashfork - Marketed in and out
of state.

President	G.E. Dunbar
Vice President	W.B. Dunbar
Maintenance Superintendent	Ron Dunbar

DUNBAR STONE COMPANY

Mr. Dunbar said their business was about as usual. Mr. Frank Gumm stated that the town of Ashfork had finally received \$500,000 from the Federal Government and they had purchased the water system from Mr. Dunbar. He also said they (the town) had contracted for an 18" well to be drilled 1750 feet about a mile SE of the town. GW WR 8/28/74

RRB WR 10/30/81: Visited the Dunbar Stone Company, 716 Lewis, Ashfork AZ. Got information for Active Mines from the secretary.

RRB WR 8/16/85: Visited Dunbar Stone Co (Paulden Sand & Rock - file) in Ashfork. Business was reported to be good.

=====

Dir. of Mining - August 1971 - 9 employees.

Saw Mr. Dunbar of the Dunbar Stone Company in Ashfork who stated that their business was rather slow. GW WR 2/3/72

Mr. Dunbar of the Dunbar Stone Company said he had given up trying to fight the bureaucrats. He said he had a number of orders but everyone seemed to like welfare payments better than wages, hence, wouldn't go on a job. GW WR 4/7/72

Visited with Mr. Dunbar of Dunbar Stone Company who said he had orders for 30 carloads of veneer stone but was having difficulty getting it out of the ground due to an extreme shortage of skilled quarrymen. GW WR 6/9/72

Stopped at both flagstone plants in Ashfork but none of the officials were in. GW WR 9/7/72

Active Mine List - October 1972 - Empl. 9,

Accompanied Mr. Schell in locating all leases in T23N R3W. Took Mr. Schell back to his house and returned to the Dunbar quarries in Sec. 30, T23N R3W. It began raining about 1:30 PM so I went back to Ashfork as Mr. Schell had told me the trails wer very boggy when wet. 7/10/73

Examined the Dunbar and Felton quarries in Sec. 20, T23N R3W and the two Schell diggings in Sec. 12, T23N R3W until the rains came again about 4:30 P.M. 7/11/73

Examined the Dunbar quarry in Sec. 34, T24N R2W. Then went to Ashfork for a conference with Mr. R.E. Dunbar of Dunbar Stone Company. He said they hadn't dug any stone from State land for some time but when he received orders for certain types of stone they would quarry where the particular type occurred. The operation of a flagstone quarry is apparently very wasteful as Mr. Dunbar stated that somewhere between 20-40% of the stone moved is saleable. 7/12/73

Mr. Dunbar, president of Dunbar Stone Company said they are now in the sand and gravel and redimix business and have about 25 employees. He also said the City of Ashfork hadn't started their water well as yet, because they haven't received the Federal finances to buy the water supply system from him. GW WR 10/4/73

DUNBAR STONE CO.

This property active Sept. 1958, Feb. 1959, Oct. 1959, Feb. 1960,
Sept. 1960, Feb. 1961, Oct. 1961, Feb. 1962,
Oct. 1962

Visited Dunbar mill, Ashfork, 10 men working. Dunbar buying his stone from independent
producers. EGW WR 1-25-63

Visited Dunbar Stone Co. - They are enlarging their plant. Three new larger saws
have been ordered. EGW WR 9-17-63

Active Mine List Oct. 1963

Visited Dunbar Flagstone Mill, 10 men in the mill and 3 in the quarries. EGW WR 5-19-64

Dunbar Stone Plant - 12 employed FTJ WR 9-10-65

Visited Dunbar Stone Plant at Ashfork. Their operation is about the same as 1965.
FTJ WR 5-15-66

Interviewed Mr. Dunbar at his office in Ashfork, says the demand has fallen off.
FTJ WR 9-16-66

Interview at the Dunbar Stone plant - reported a slow down in sales. FTJ WR 5-12-67

Active Mine List April 1967 - 6-8 men

Visited both Western States Stone Co. Plant and Dunbar Plant. Both said sales were
some improved, but they have a healthy stockpile. FTJ WR 9-8-67

Active Mine List Oct. 1967 - 6 men
Active Mine List April 1968 - 7 men

Visited Dunbar Stone office - operations normal. FTJ WR 9-13-68

Active Mine List Oct. 1968 - 7 men

Interview with Robert Dunbar at Dunbar Stone Plant. He said business was picking up.
FTJ WR 4-11-69

Active Mine List April 1969 - 9 men G. 246
Active Mine List October 1969 - 9 men G. - R. E. Dunbar - Box 858, Ashfork
Active Mine List May 1970 - 9 men - R. E. Dunbar
Active Mine List Oct. 1970 - ~~4 men - R. E. Dunbar, Drake~~ - 9 men - G. E. Dunbar, Box 246,
Ashfork



IN REPLY REFER TO:

United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS INTERIOR BOARD OF LAND APPEALS

4015 WILSON BOULEVARD
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22203

UNITED STATES
V.
DUNBAR STONE CO.

IBLA 80-780

Decided July 10, 1981

Appeal from decision of Administrative Law Judge Michael L. Morehouse declaring the New Strike Nos. 1 through 7 placer mining claims, the New Strike Nos. 1 through 7 lode claims, the Evergreen Nos. 1 through 6 lode mining claims, and the Evergreen Nos. 1 through 6 placer mining claims invalid. AZ 10637.

Affirmed.

1. Mining Claims: DETERMINATION OF VALIDITY; LOCATABLE PUBLIC LANDS--Withdrawn Lands--effect of withdrawals.

A mining claim located on land previously withdrawn from appropriation under the mining law is null and void ab initio.

2. Mining Claims: COMMON VARIETIES OF MINERALS--Building Stone--special and distinct value--Defined--Location Subsequent to July 23, 1955; REGULATIONS--Applicability.

Where deposit of Yavapai schist has pleasant coloration and allegedly can be blasted out and broken in such a manner as to tend to maintain unfeathered edges, it is nevertheless a common variety of building stone and is, therefore, unlocatable, as these characteristics are not unique properties setting it apart from vast amounts of other common stone found throughout the area where the deposit is situated.

INDEX CODE:

43 CFR 4.1
43 CFR 3842.1-2(b)
43 CFR 3842.1-5(d)
43 CFR 3842.2(b)

56 IBLA 61

GFS(MIN) 194(1981)

DUNBAR STONE CO.

This property active Sept. 1958, Feb. 1959, Oct. 1959, Feb. 1960,
Sept. 1960, Feb. 1961, Oct. 1961, Feb. 1962,
Oct. 1962

Visited Dunbar mill, Ashfork, 10 men working. Dunbar buying his stone from independent
producers. EGW WR 1-25-63

Visited Dunbar Stone Co. - They are enlarging their plant. Three new larger saws
have been ordered. EGW WR 9-17-63

Active Mine List Oct. 1963

Visited Dunbar Flagstone Mill, 10 men in the mill and 3 in the quarries. EGW WR 5-19-64

Dunbar Stone Plant - 12 employed FTJ WR 9-10-65

Visited Dunbar Stone Plant at Ashfork. Their operation is about the same as 1965.
FTJ WR 5-15-66

Interviewed Mr. Dunbar at his office in Ashfork, says the demand has fallen off.
FTJ WR 9-16-66

Interview at the Dunbar Stone plant - reported a slow down in sales. FTJ WR 5-12-67

Active Mine List April 1967 - 6-8 men

Visited both Western States Stone Co. Plant and Dunbar Plant. Both said sales were
some improved, but they have a healthy stockpile. FTJ WR 9-8-67

Active Mine List Oct. 1967 - 6 men
Active Mine List April 1968 - 7 men

Visited Dunbar Stone office - operations normal. FTJ WR 9-13-68

Active Mine List Oct. 1968 - 7 men

Interview with Robert Dunbar at Dunbar Stone Plant. He said business was picking up.
FTJ WR 4-11-69

Active Mine List April 1969 - 9 men G. 246
Active Mine List October 1969 - 9 men G. - R. E. Dunbar - Box 858, Ashfork
Active Mine List May 1970 - 9 men - R. E. Dunbar
Active Mine List Oct. 1970 - ~~4 men - Bill Baum, Drake~~ - 9 men - G. E. Dunbar, Box 246,
Ashfork



IN REPLY REFER TO:

United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS INTERIOR BOARD OF LAND APPEALS

4015 WILSON BOULEVARD
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22203

UNITED STATES
V.
DUNBAR STONE CO.

IBLA 80-780

Decided July 10, 1981

Appeal from decision of Administrative Law Judge Michael L. Morehouse declaring the New Strike Nos. 1 through 7 placer mining claims, the New Strike Nos. 1 through 7 lode claims, the Evergreen Nos. 1 through 6 lode mining claims, and the Evergreen Nos. 1 through 6 placer mining claims invalid. AZ 10637.

Affirmed.

1. Mining Claims: DETERMINATION OF VALIDITY; LOCATABLE PUBLIC LANDS--Withdrawn Lands--effect of withdrawals.

A mining claim located on land previously withdrawn from appropriation under the mining law is null and void ab initio.

2. Mining Claims: COMMON VARIETIES OF MINERALS--Building Stone--special and distinct value--Defined--Location Subsequent to July 23, 1955; REGULATIONS--Applicability.

Where deposit of Yavapai schist has pleasant coloration and allegedly can be blasted out and broken in such a manner as to tend to maintain unfeathered edges, it is nevertheless a common variety of building stone and is, therefore, unlocatable, as these characteristics are not unique properties setting it apart from vast amounts of other common stone found throughout the area where the deposit is situated.

INDEX CODE:

43 CFR 4.1
43 CFR 3842.1-2(b)
43 CFR 3842.1-5(d)
43 CFR 3842.2(b)

56 IBLA 61

GFS(MIN) 194(1981)

3. Mining Claims: DISCOVERY; PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE--
Contests--burden of proof--evidence--prima facie case.

When the Government contests a mining claim, it bears only the burden of going forward with sufficient evidence to establish a prima facie case; the burden then shifts to the claimant to show by a preponderance of the evidence that a discovery has been made and is present within the limits of the claim.

4. Mining Claims: DISCOVERY; PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE--
Contests--determination of validity--evidence--
prima facie case.

Where a Government mineral examiner testifies that he has examined a mining claim and found the mineral values insufficient to support a finding of discovery, a prima facie case has been established, and if not rebutted, the mining claim is properly declared invalid.

5. Mining Claims: PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE--Administra-
tive Law Judge--Administrative Procedure Act--Ap-
peals--de novo review--substantial evidence rule--
Board of Land Appeals; REGULATIONS--Applicability.

On appeal from or review of the initial decision, the agency has all the powers which it would have in making the initial decision. The powers of an agency reviewing an initial or recommended decision of an Administrative Law Judge are greater than those of an appellate court reviewing the decision of a trial judge.

APPEARANCES: William B. Fortner, Esq., Prescott, Arizona, for the appellant; T. Adrian Pedron, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Albuquerque, New Mexico, for the Forest Service.

OPINION BY ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE STUEBING

On February 28, 1978, the Arizona State Director, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), acting on behalf of the Forest Service (FS), U.S. Department of Agriculture, initiated a complaint contesting the validity

of 26 mining claims: the New Strike Nos. 1 through 7 lode claims, New Strike Nos. 1 through 7 placer claims, Evergreen Nos. 1 through 6 lode claims, and Evergreen Nos. 1 through 6 placer claims. Dunbar Stone Company (Dunbar) and G. H. Seebold were named as owners of the claims and contestees in the proceeding. The complaint alleged that no valid discovery existed on these claims, and that the lands embraced within their limits are nonmineral in character. The complaint also specifically alleged that a deposit of stone found within the limits of the placer claims is not a valuable mineral deposit under section 3 of the Act of July 23, 1955, 69 Stat. 367, 30 U.S.C. § 611 (1976), the so-called "Common Varieties Act."

Dunbar filed a timely answer generally denying these allegations and advised BLM that it had purchased Seebold's interests in the claims. Subsequently, BLM referred the matter to the Hearings Division of the Office of Hearings and Appeals for appointment of an Administrative Law Judge for a hearing, which took place on June 6 and 7, 1979, in Phoenix, Arizona.

On June 24, 1980, Administrative Law Judge Michael L. Morehouse issued his decision declaring these claims invalid, from which decision Dunbar (appellant) has appealed.

[1] The New Strike and Evergreen placer claims were all located on September 28, 1976. On this date, a portion of the lands on which the New Strike Nos. 3, 6, and 7 claims are situated was withdrawn from mineral entry by Public Land Order (PLO) No. 2303 (Govt Exhs. 3 and 4; Tr. 8-14). Mining claims located on lands which are withdrawn from mineral entry at the time of location are null and void ab initio. Accordingly, those portions of these three claims lying within the E 1/2 NW 1/4 and the E 1/2 sec. 17, T. 13 N., R. 1 W., Gila and Salt River meridian, are null and void. I/

[2] The only mineral deposit supporting the validity of the balance of the placer claims situated outside the withdrawn area is Yavapai schist, a stone which appellant has sold for building purposes for use as stone facing on buildings. Schist was first removed from these claims in 1967 or 1968 under a special use permit which expired in 1976, after which the claims in question were located.

There is little doubt that the mineral deposit satisfies the marketability test, which is the sine qua non to the validity of any

I/ As we have concluded that there was no discovery of "a valuable mineral deposit" on these placer claims, it is unnecessary to consider either whether the irregularity of their configuration or acreage (see 43 CFR 3842.1-5(d)), or whether the effect of the failure to conform the New Strike Nos. 1 through 7 placer claims to the rectangular survey system as required by 43 CFR 3842.1-2(b) affect their validity.

mining claim, as appellant has presented documentation showing considerable sales of schist from these claims. However, maintaining a profitable mining operation does not by itself establish a valid claim where the material being mined was not locatable when claimed because it is a "common variety."

Until July 23, 1955, valid mining claims could be located and maintained for lands chiefly valuable for building stone, under the terms of the Mining Law of 1872 and the Act of August 4, 1892. However, in the Act of July 23, 1955, Congress excluded, *inter alia*, "common varieties" of stone from location. The Supreme Court, in United States v. Coleman, 390 U.S. 599 (1968),^a held that this last Act also excluded common varieties of building stone from location.

The Act of July 23, 1955, provides that a deposit having a property giving it distinct and special value is not a common variety. Thus, in order to be valid, any mining claim for building stone located after July 23, 1955, must contain a deposit of building stone which has a property giving it distinct and special value, *i.e.*, a deposit of an "uncommon variety." This requirement is in addition to the requirement that the deposit be "valuable" under the marketability test. 43 CFR 3842.2(b).

In McClarty v. Secretary of Interior, 408 F.2d 907 (9th Cir. 1969),^b the Ninth Circuit considered the standards [by] which [to] distinguish [between] common varieties from [and] uncommon varieties of building stone, as follows:

(1) [T]here must be a comparison of the mineral deposit in question with other deposits of such mineral generally; (2) [to be an uncommon variety,] the mineral deposit in question must have an unique property; (3) the unique property must give the deposit a distinct and special value; (4) if the special value is for uses to which ordinary varieties of the mineral are put, the deposit must have some distinct and special value for such use; and (5) the distinct and special value must be reflected by the higher price which the material commands in the market place.

Id. at 908.

Thus, the first step in determining whether the Yavapai schist is an uncommon variety (and therefore locatable) is to determine whether it has a "unique property." Appellant's witnesses stressed the pleasant earth tone coloration of the schist, and its ability to be blasted out and broken in such a manner as to tend to maintain sharp unfeathered edges. Both of these traits, they testified, were unusual and set the material apart from other types of schist from the area. Testimony by

a) GFS(MIN) JD-1(1968)

b) GFS(MIN) JD-1(1970)

Gerhardt Seebold, who located the subject stone placers and operated the quarries for 15 years, set the volume of this stone within the claims at 60,000 tons (Tr. 160, 241).

Appellant's witnesses testified that Apache Stone and Supply, Inc. (Apache), sells schist, and that this schist is available in earth tones but that its product was not as beautifully colored as that found on appellant's claims. Attractive coloration, even if unusual, does not distinguish a deposit of stone from other deposits of the same stone so as to justify the conclusion that the deposit has a distinct and special property, where comparable stone is abundant and is found with varied coloration. United States v. Mansfield, 35 IBLA 95 (1978);^c United States v. Brubaker, 9 IBLA 281, 80 I.D. 261 (1973),^d aff'd Brubaker v. Morton, 500 F.2d 200 (9th Cir. 1974); United States v. Shannon, 70 I.D. 136 (1963);^e United States v. Ligier, A-29011 (Oct. 8, 1962).^f This is because beauty of coloration is inherently subjective. One type of coloration from among the infinite variety of nature may appeal to some persons, and this coloration may in fact be unusual. However, the fact that one deposit of a material may bear this coloration does not make it unique, as there are often deposits which will do the same job to the full satisfaction of the other persons. Appellant makes no price distinction based on the various colors (Tr. 314).

The record shows that there is a vast amount of Yavapai schist of varying coloration throughout the area where appellant's claims are situated, and that Apache is selling comparable material, even though its coloration may be different from that found on appellant's claims. Accordingly, we find that the color of appellant's schist is not a distinct and special property having special economic value.

Appellant makes a great point of the fact that most schist rock from other sources has a high percentage of tapered or "feathered" edges, which make it difficult or unsuitable for laying up in a wall, whereas the Dunbar schist yields a low percentage of feather-edged stone, and thus is much more desirable. But simply because this may be uncommonly good schist does not necessarily make it uncommonly good stone. There are many other types of common stone which are suitable for wall facing. Were we to hold that a deposit of a particular kind of country rock is uncommon merely because, unlike much rock of the same kind, it rises to a standard of acceptance for masonry work, we would be obliged to hold that vast quantities of other common stones suitable for such purpose are locatable under the mining law, notwithstanding the prohibitions of the Act of July 23, 1955, in that regard. We are not obliged to consider how a particular deposit of a common stone type ranks when compared only with other deposits of the same generic type (i.e., limestone, sandstone, shale, granite, basalt, slate, etc.), and hold that a superior or unusual occurrence of that particular

c) GFS(MIN) 49(1978)

d) GFS(MIN) 31(1973)

e) GFS(MIN) S0-18(1963)

f) GFS(MIN) S0-33(1962)

type is an uncommon variety, when its special characteristics only make it suitable to be used in the same manner as common varieties of other types. Appellant's argument and evidence centers on the desirability of this deposit of schist, "compared to other schist that you get," (contestee's appeal brief, p. 6), but in considering common building stone we are not limited to comparing schist only with other schist, limestone only with other limestone, granite only with other granite.

Schist is a common variety of stone, widespread and vastly abundant. Like many other types of common stone, it is frequently used as a building stone. It is a widely-accepted truism that nature does not duplicate exactly, i.e., that there are no two identical snowflakes, fingerprints, trees, mountains, etc. Each product of nature may be expected to have some distinct feature or unique characteristic which will distinguish it from others of its kind, and perhaps either enhance its value or render it worthless. But where these qualities only serve to make a common stone suitable or desirable for a common purpose, such as construction, without imparting any marked, special, economic advantage over the broad range of other common building stones, that stone cannot be considered an exception to the statutory bar against the location of "common varieties" of stone imposed by 30 U.S.C. § 611 (1976).

As we observed in United States v. Guzman, 18 IBLA 109, 124, 81 I.D. 685, 692 (1974),⁸ a case in which we held that the natural sharp angularity of particles of sand did not make a deposit of the sand unique:

Common varieties of a particular mineral material do not have to be physically alike or equally desirable for a given purpose. For example, many kinds of common rock may be used to build a wall and, because their physical properties differ, certain kinds of common rock may be preferred for this purpose and, in fact, make a better wall and command a better price. Nevertheless, they remain common varieties of rock because their physical properties are not unique or rare.

So it is here; the angularity of this schist, even if naturally occurring, is inadequate to make it uniquely valuable in an economic sense. As Judge Morehouse found, the commonness of the schist found on appellant's claims is also reflected by the abundance of similar stone found near these claims, on lands outside their boundaries.

Much of the testimony for contestee at the hearing came from stone masons and masonry contractors who recited the advantages realized in laying schist from appellant's claims as opposed to schist from other sources because of the relatively squared (as opposed to feathered)

g) GFS(MIN) 2(1975)

edges. However, contestee failed to establish that this characteristic was reflected in either a higher market price when compared with similar materials or in a unique advantage in cost of production (quarrying) of the stone. McClarty v. Secretary of the Interior, *supra*. Comparison of price lists of contestee and Apache Stone, a competitor in the market for schist for building stone, shows the prices to be very similar (Exhibits G-29 and G-30).

This schist is readily distinguishable from "cliffstone" and "heatherstone," other types of building stone which we have recognized as unique in, respectively, United States v. Pope, 25 IBLA 199 (1976),^h and United States v. McClarty, 17 IBLA 20, 81 I.D. 472 (1974).ⁱ These stones were unique in that they could be removed for sale and use with practically no expense, simply by prying them out of formation with a bar, a distinct and special economic advantage. Appellant admits that the schist on his claim must be drilled and blasted out of the formation, and then split with a maul, or with a hammer and chisel, a time-consuming and expensive process associated with removal of common stone (Tr. 268).

Accordingly, we affirm Judge Morehouse's finding that the schist building stone found on the New Strike Nos. 1 through 7 and Evergreen Nos. 1 through 6 placer mining claims is not unique and is, therefore, a common variety of mineral. As such, it is not locatable under the mining laws, and these claims are therefore null and void.

[3, 4] Turning to the New Strike Nos. 1 through 7 and Evergreen Nos. 1 through 6 lode mining claims, we have thoroughly reviewed the record of this case and have concluded that Judge Morehouse's findings are correct. Accordingly, we adopt his decision that these claims are invalid as our own.

The affidavit of William B. Fortner, filed with appellant's statement of reasons, concerning samples taken from the claims is not cognizable, as it is evidence which should have been presented at the hearing in this matter. We decline to grant it any weight, as it has not been subject to cross-examination. While such a submission bears on whether to reopen the record for further presentation of evidence, we will not do so here in view of the strong indications in the record that these claims have been largely mined out and that the expense of processing ore from them is high.


[5] Finally, although we here affirm the findings of fact made below, we note that FS, in its answer, asserts that "[t]he question of whether Judge Morehouse's fact finding should be reversed is determined by reference to the substantial evidence rule." This is incorrect. The Board of Land Appeals, as the delegate of the Secretary of the Interior, 43 CFR 4.1, has the authority to make decisions concerning the public lands as fully and finally as might the Secretary himself.

h) GFS(MIN) 40(1976)


i) GFS(MIN) 55(1974)

This authority includes the power to make a de novo review of the entire administrative record and to make findings of fact based thereon. While we recognize the propriety of deferring to the Administrative Law Judge's findings where a witness' demeanor affects his credibility, our authority to make findings of fact which may differ from the former's is not limited by the substantial evidence rule in the manner stated. "On appeal from or review of the initial decision, the agency has all the powers which it would have in making the initial decision * * *" 5 U.S.C. § 557 (1976). "The powers of an agency reviewing an initial or recommended decision of an examiner [now Administrative Law Judge] are greater than those of an appellate court reviewing the decision of a trial judge." N.L.R.B. v. A.P.W. Products Co., 316 F.2d 899 (2nd Cir. 1963).

Therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to the Board of Land Appeals by the Secretary of the Interior, 43 CFR 4.1, the decision appealed from is affirmed.


Edward W. Stuebing
Administrative Judge

We concur:


Douglas E. Henriques
Administrative Judge


C. Randall Grant, Jr.
Administrative Judge

DEPARTMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

STATE OF ARIZONA
FIELD ENGINEERS REPORT

Mine Dunbar Stone Yard

Date August 27, 1958

District Ash Fork, Yavapai County

Engineer Travis P. Lane

Subject: Visit

246

Owner & Operator: Dunbar Stone Co., Box 358, Ash Fork, Arizona

G.

Mr. K. E. Dunbar, President of the Corporation, is the principal stockholder.
Mr. Richard Mow is Plant Superintendent.

The company operates a stone cutting yard on the north edge of the city of Williams and owns a number of flagstone deposits in the Williams, Seligman and Drake areas. Quarrying operations are conducted at 1 deposit near Drake and 2 deposits near Seligman. Two or three men are employed at each place. The most important producer at the present time is the Antolini Hills deposit some 6 miles NE of Seligman. Company-owned quarries account for about 40% of the flagstone needs of the plant, the rest is purchased from independent producers. The yard crew averages 10 men and plant output is currently around 300 tons per month.

DEPARTMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

State of Arizona

MINE OWNER'S REPORT

(Dunker Stone Co.)

Date 4-18-58

- 1. Mine: Several claims
- 2. Location: Sec. _____ Twp. _____ Range. _____ Nearest Town. ASH FORK Distance 40 Mi. Redding
 Direction all Nearest R.R. AT&SF Distance _____
 Road Conditions Poor
- 3. Mining District and County: Yavapai
- 4. Former Name of Mine: _____
- 5. Owner: Dunker Stone Co Inc.
 Address: Box 858 Ash Fork Ariz
- 6. Operator: R.E. Dunker
 Address: Above
- 7. Principal Minerals: Sand Stone
- 8. Number of Claims: Lode _____ Patented _____ Unpatented _____
 Placer _____ Patented _____ Unpatented _____
- 9. Type of Surrounding Terrain: rough

10. Geology and Mineralization: _____

11. Dimension and Value of Ore Body: _____

Please give as complete information as possible and attach copies of engineer's reports, shipment returns, maps, etc. if you wish to have them available in this Department's files for inspection by prospective lessors or buyers.

12. Ore "Blocked Out" or "In sight":

Ore Probable:

13. Mine Workings—Amount and Condition:

No.	Feet	Condition
Shafts		
Raises		
Tunnels		
Crosscuts		
Stopes		

14. Water Supply:

15. Brief History:

16. Remarks: 27 Men employed

17. If Property for Sale, List Approximate Price and Terms:

18. Signature: Reynold Stone Co Inc.
R Stone