Resource Estimate of the Pea Ridge Iron Ore Tailings Project

Prepared for

Sangra Moller

August 27, 2012

DE-00289





165 South Union Boulevard, Suite 950 Lakewood, Colorado 80228-2226

> 303-986-6950 Fax 303-987-8907

www.pincock.com

Resource Estimate of the Pea Ridge Iron Ore Tailings Project

Prepared for

Sangra Moller

August 27, 2012

DE-00289

Prepared by

Pincock, Allen & Holt

Esteban Acuña

IMPORTANT INFORMATION ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

1. Our Client

This report has been produced by or on behalf of Pincock, Allen & Holt (PAH) solely for Sangra Moller (the Client).

2. Client Use

The Client's use and disclosure of this report is subject to the terms and conditions under which PAH prepared the report.

3. Notice to Third Parties

PAH prepared this report for the Client only. If you are not the Client:

- PAH has prepared this report having regard to the particular needs and interests of the Client, and in accordance with the Client's instructions. It did not draft this report having regard to any other person's particular needs or interests. Your needs and interests may be distinctly different to the Client's needs and interests, and the report may not be sufficient, fit or appropriate for your purposes.
- PAH does not make and expressly disclaims from making any representation or warranty to you express or implied regarding this report or the conclusions or opinions set out in this report (including without limitation any representation or warranty regarding the standard of care used in preparing this report, or that any forward-looking statements, forecasts, opinions or projections contained in the report will be achieved, will prove to be correct or are based on reasonable assumptions).
- PAH expressly disclaims any liability to you and any duty of care to you.
- PAH does not authorize you to rely on this report. If you choose to use or rely on all or part of this report, then any loss or damage you may suffer in so doing is at your sole and exclusive risk.

4. Inputs, Subsequent Changes and no Duty to Update

PAH has created this report using data and information provided by or on behalf of the Client [and Client's agents and contractors]. Unless specifically stated otherwise, PAH has not independently verified that data and information. PAH accepts no liability for the accuracy or completeness of that data and information, even if that data and information has been incorporated into or relied upon in creating this report (or parts of it).

The conclusions and opinions contained in this report apply as at the date of the report. Events (including changes to any of the data and information that PAH used in preparing the report) may have occurred since that date which may impact on those conclusions and opinions and make them unreliable. PAH is under no duty to update the report upon the occurrence of any such event, though it reserves the right to do so.

5. Mining Unknown Factors

The ability of any person to achieve forward-looking production and economic targets is dependent on numerous factors that are beyond PAH's control and that PAH cannot anticipate. These factors include, but are not limited to, site-specific mining and geological conditions, management and personnel capabilities, availability of funding to properly operate and capitalize the operation, variations in cost elements and market conditions, developing and operating the mine in an efficient manner, unforeseen changes in legislation and new industry developments. Any of these factors may substantially alter the performance of any mining operation.

CON	TENTS	<u>Page</u>
1.0	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND INTRODUTION	1
	1.1 Information Available	1
2.0	EXPLORATION DATA ANALYSIS, DOMAINING AND MODELING TFE, S, AND SAT	4
3.0	EXPLORATION DATA ANALYSIS REE	13
4.0	ESTIMATION	18
5.0	DENSITY	25
6.0	RESULTS	28
TAB	LES	
1-1	Results of Estimation	1
2-1 2-2 2-3	Correlation Matrix of SAT, TFE, and S Stats of TFE, SAT, and S Thickness of the Levels	4 10 9
3-1 3-2 3-3 3-4 3-5	REE Stats Y_2O_3 and Apatite Stats Correlation Matrix of LREE Correlation Matrix of HREE Cross-Correlation Matrix of LREE-HREE	13 13 14 14 17
4-1	Summary by Domain	18
5-1	Density Statistics	25
6-1	Results of Estimation	28
FIGU	IRES	
1-1	Location Map, A-A' and B-B' Sections	2
2-1 2-2 2-3 2-4	A-A' Section showing high TFE Values in the Upper Level Depth vs SAT Graph, Shows SAT Values Dropping with the Depth A-A' Section showing Surfaces Used to Constrain the Interpolation B-B' Section showing Surfaces Used to Constrain the Interpolation	5 6 7 8

CONTENTS (Continued)

2-5	Contact Analysis Between Upper Level on the Left and Lower Level on the Right	11
2-6	Perspective View of the Interpolation Zone	12
3-1	LREE 3D Distribution	15
3-2	HREE 3D Distribution	16
4-1	TFE Upper Level Correlograms	19
4-2	TFE Lower Level Correlograms	20
4-3	Swath Plot TFE in the Lower Level to East Direction	21
4-4	Swath Plot TFE in the Lower Level Elevation	22
4-5	Swath Plot TFE in the Upper Level to East Direction	23
4-6	Swath Plot TFE in the Upper Level Elevation	24
5-1	TFE Density Samples Correlation	26
5-2	TFE Density Blocks Correlation	27
6-1	Level 885, TFE Blocks vs TFE Composites	29
6-2	Level 845, TFE Blocks vs TFE Composites	30

<u>Page</u>

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND INTRODUCTION

Pincock Allen & Holt (PAH) has been retained by Pea Ridge Resources to complete a Preliminary Economic Assessment (PEA) of the economic viability on reworking the tailings of the Pea Ridge iron mine near Sullivan, Missouri to recover iron as magnetite and hematite, and rare earth elements (REE) contained within the mineral apatite and apatite as a possible feedstock for fertilizer production.

PAH developed a drilling program which was carried out by Pea Ridge Resources to obtain samples of the tailings. Seventy-four holes were drilled for a total of 4,184 feet of drilling; 1,692 samples were collected. These samples were assayed for magnetic (SAT) and total iron (TFe), and 39 additional elements which included the entire suite of light and heavy REE.

This report includes the results of the resource estimation, first step in completing the PEA. Prior to estimating the resources, the REE were converted to oxides and divided into heavy (HREO) and light (LREO) groups. In addition yttrium was converted to an oxide and the phosphorus was converted to apatite using the ideal formula for apatite and assuming al the P was contained within the apatite.

The results of the resource estimates are shown in Table 1-1 for various cutoffs of total iron.

TABLE 1-1 Sangra Moller Pea Ridge Tailings, Resource Estimate Results of Estimation

Cutoff	FeT (%)	Short Tons	Fe (M lb)	% Fe (Mag)	S (%)	LREO (ppm)	HREO (ppm)	Y₂O₃ (ppm)	Apatite (%)
0	19.8	27,216,513	10,772.3	3.430	0.110	3,953	328	648.1	10.0
10	19.8	27,093,313	10,745.2	3.440	0.110	3,952	328	647.8	10.0
25	27.9	8,233,827	4,586.2	6.120	0.110	3,609	284	556.2	9.7

1.1 Information Available

PAH constructed a drill hole database in EXCEL format from the assay certificates received from American Assay and Lerch Brothers Lab. Lerch Brothers prepped the samples and provided magnetic iron assays (SAT), total iron (TFe) and sulfur (S) assays while American assay reported assays for 39 elements including the rare earth elements (REE). In addition PAH was supplied with current and pre-tailings topographies in AutoCAD files. All information for SAT, TFe, S, the REE, and the topography were uploaded to Vulcan.

The database contains 74 drill holes with location and assay data. Locations are shown in Figure 1-1. The drill hole's depth varies from 10 to 114 ft. The total drilling length corresponds to 4,184 ft. Sample lengths are 2 ft, the total sampling length is 3,376 ft., and 808 ft are non-sampling intervals. All drill holes have TFe (% total Iron), SAT (% Magnetic Fe), and S (% sulfur) assays.



PAH also included in the database apatite (calculated from the phosphate assays), Y_2O_3 , light and heavy rare earth assays that were recalculated into rare earth oxides information (LREO and HREO, respectively), and sulfur. It includes 1,692 samples.

Downhole surveys were not specified and all the drill holes were assumed to be vertical.

The database was transformed from the Excel spreadsheets to ASCII files. In this process, PAH realized there were two missing collars (B-16 and B-79) which were recovered during the modeling. Additionally, the assays from B-59 were found in the B-69's spreadsheet, which was fixed by PAH.

Spacing between sections is 250 to 270 ft. and the average drill hole spacing within each section is 180 to 200 feet.

2.0 EXPLORATION DATA ANALYSIS, DOMAINING AND MODELING TFE, S AND SAT

Obviously, the material deposited in the settling ponds does not correspond to a geological process. Continuity and zonation are likely related to the production history and segregation process in the tailing ponds.

A vertical zonation of magnetic iron (SAT) was observed with high values in an upper level and lesser values in a lower zone (Figure 2-1 and Figure 2-2). SAT and total iron (TFe) show a high correlation coefficient (Table 2-1). For this reason, PAH modeled a surface to separate the higher SAT level from the lower SAT level.

The correlation coefficient (Pearson coefficient) between SAT and TFe in the upper level is higher than the lower level (0.61 versus 0.24). The TFe-S correlation increases from -0.07, in the upper level, to 0.32 in the lower level. Table 2-1 shows these correlations.

TABLE 2-1 Sangra Moller Pea Ridge Tailings, Resource Estimate Correlation Matrix of SAT, TFe, and S

Upper									
Correlation SAT TFe S									
SAT	1	0.61	-0.19						
TFe		1	-0.067						
S			1						
	Lov	wer							
Correlation	Correlation SAT TFe S								
SAT	1	0.24	0.16						
SAT TFe	1	0.24 1	0.16 0.32						

Some drill holes were below the original surface (pre-tailing surface). These samples were not used in the estimate of the tailings mineralization. Those samples are shown as *in situ* in the following tables.

The next two figures (Figures 2-3 and 2-4) show the original surface and the surface which divided the high magnetic from low magnetic level. The east part of the upper level is thinner than the west part of the tailings (Figure 2-4) while the lower low magnetic level is thinner than in the west side (Figure 2-3).

The data shown in the above figure could indicate that few iron sulfides may exist in the upper level but are likely more abundant in the lower level.









A TFe contact analysis was done between the two levels to explore if the contact was hard, gradational or soft. PAH concluded that the contact is gradational with a high first step (Figure 2-5). For this reason, it was defined a hard contact to configure the samples search in the estimation.

PAH composited the samples to 10 ft. constant-length ignoring the non-sampling intervals. TFe, SAT and S composite stats are shown in Table 2-2.

TFe and SAT upper level means are considerably higher than those of the lower level, while the mean of sulfur is slightly elevated in the lower level.

Some samples are under the pre-tailing surface and are reported in the column in situ. Although the TFe, SAT and S in situ values are similar with the lower level, these samples were excluded from any resource estimation plan.

Based on above characteristics, two domains were defined to estimate TFe and SAT: Upper Level and Lower Level. S was estimated using the whole body, upper and lower level together. The average thicknesses of each level is shown in Table 2-3.

TABLE 2-3Sangra MollerPea Ridge Tailings, Resource EstimateThickness of the Levels

	Thickness (ft)
Upper level	20.6
Lower level	37.4

The estimation was constrained within the volume generated between the current topography and pretailings surface plus a bound built around the samples which was drawn avoiding the current settling ponds.

Figure 2-6 shows a perspective view of the interpolation zone. Using this solid, a sub-block model was built to estimate TFe, SAT, S, AP, TLREO and THREO. The minimum block size is $25 \times 25 \times 5$ ft and the maximum block size is $50 \times 50 \times 10$ ft.

TABLE 2-2 Sangra Moller Pea Ridge Tailings, Resource Estimate Stats of TFe, SAT and S

40.5		S	AT			TFe (%)				S (%)			
Com	ALL	Upper zone	Lower zone	In Situ	ALL	Upper zone	Lower zone	In Situ	ALL	Upper zone	Lower zone	In Situ	
N	436	148	254	34	436	148	254	34	436	148	254	34	
Mean	3.14	5.77	1.78	1.89	19	25.98	15.6	13.8	0.11	0.115	0.112	0.08	
Min	0.52	1.44	0.52	0.62	4.87	10.67	7.75	4.9	0.0145	0.028	0.0145	0.026	
Max	13.63	13.63	7.81	5.35	38.2	38.7	36.7	26.98	0.553	0.518	0.553	0.159	
Var	6.22	6.19	0.83	1.08	56.4	37.9	27.2	29.7	0.0024	0.003	0.0023	0.001	
Q1	1.33	3.72	1.21	1.08	12.7	21.3	11.7	10.2	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.061	
Median	2.13	5.5	1.49	1.7	17.2	26.5	14.34	12.8	0.106	0.11	0.106	0.082	
Q3	4.13	7.2	2.03	2.32	25	30.8	18.02	16.8	0.134	0.14	0.134	0.112	



Prepared by pincock, allen & holt 165 S. Union Boulevard, Suite 950 Lakewood, Colorado 80228 Phone (303) 986-6950 Project No. DE-00289	Drawing Provided by/Prepared for Sangra Moller Project Name Pea Ridge Tailings	FIGURE 2-6 Perspective View of the Interpolation Zone	Date of Issue Aug. 2012 Drawing Name Fig.2-6.dwg

3.0 EXPLORATION DATA ANALYSIS REE

There are 1,692 samples with assays for Light/Heavy Rare Earth (LRE LREE and HREE, respectively), Y_2O_3 and P (Apatite). The assays were reported as ppm for the elements but were converted to rare earth oxides by multiplying the elemental assay by a factor that represents the ratio in molecular weight between the element and its corresponding oxide. In addition, the phosphate assays were converted to apatite using the same method. The REE elements assayed were Ce, Eu, La, Nd, Pr and Sm in the LREE and Dy, Er, Gd, Ho, Lu, Tb, Tm, Yb in the HREE, Y and P were assayed as well. The statistics of their oxide form are shown in Tables 3-1 and 3-2.

TABLE 3-1 Sangra Moller Pea Ridge Tailings, Resource Estimate REE Stats

Oxide	Ν	Mean ppm	Min ppm	Max ppm	Variance	Q1 ppm	Median ppm	Q3 ppm	CV
Ce ₂ O ₃	1691	1964.4	24	4166	427,162.5	1571	1991	2379	0.33
Eu ₂ O ₃	1691	7.45	1	17	6	6	7	9	0.33
La_2O_3	1691	1,119.1	24	2595	158,883	862	1136	1364	0.36
Nd_2O_3	1692	657	8	1333	51,133	509	668	816	0.34
Pr ₂ O ₃	1691	162.9	2	415	3,659	123	164	204	0.37
Sm_2O_3	1685	99.1	1	816	1,536	76	99	123	0.40
LREO	1692	4,007.6	63	8639	1,803,485	3,186	4,063	4,866	0.34
Dy ₂ O ₃	1692	81.8	1	153	632	68	84	97	0.31
Er_2O_3	1692	56	2	113	309	46	56	67	0.31
Gd_2O_3	1684	98.8	1	193	1,065	79	99	119	0.33
Ho ₂ O ₃	1526	7.58	1	25	23	4	7	11	0.63
Lu_2O_3	1686	11.2	1	29	12	9	11	13	0.31
Tb ₂ O ₃	1641	15.9	1	136	41	13	16	19	0.40
Tm ₂ O ₃	1662	5.6	1	12	3.6	4	6	7	0.34
Yb ₂ O ₃	1692	57.6	1	109	301	48	58	69	0.30
HREO	1692	332.6	5	640	10,486	276	336	397	0.31

TABLE 3-2 Sangra Moller Pea Ridge Tailings, Resource Estimate Y₂O₃ and Apatite Stats

Oxide	Ν	Mean	Min	Max	Var	Q1	Median	Q3	CV
Y_2O_3	1,692	658.3 ppm	13 ppm	1,262 ppm	38,554	545	679 ppm	791	0.30
Apatite	1,692	10%	0.17%	68.9%	18	7.4	10.2%	12.7	0.42

It is remarkable that Apatite, LREO and HREO present a low coefficient of variation; therefore, any lineal estimation will have an accurate result.

A visual inspection to analyze the behavior of LREO and HREO was executed concluding that both, LREO and HREO were higher in the east bottom part of the tailing pond. Additionally, we can conclude that HREO had a higher variability than LREO. The next two figures (Figures 3-1 and 3-2) show the LREO and HREO grades distribution.

Correlation among each LREO (Table 3-3) and each HREO (Table 3-4) is higher than 0.75 and 0.5 (Pearson coefficient), respectively. Correlation among LREO and HREO, shown in Table 3-5 is higher than 0.4.

TABLE 3-3 Sangra Moller Pea Ridge Tailings, Resource Estimate Correlation Matrix of LREE

	Ce ₂ O ₃	Eu ₂ O ₃	La ₂ O ₃	Nd ₂ O ₃	Pr ₂ O ₃	Sm ₂ O ₃
Ce ₂ O ₃	1.00	0.89	0.95	0.92	0.90	0.77
Eu ₂ O ₃		1.00	0.86	0.88	0.88	0.78
La ₂ O ₃			1.00	0.88	0.86	0.75
Nd ₂ O ₃				1.00	0.96	0.79
Pr ₂ O ₃					1.00	0.78
Sm ₂ O ₃						1.00

TABLE 3-4 Sangra Moller Pea Ridge Tailings, Resource Estimate Correlation Matrix of HREE

	Dy ₂ O ₃	Er ₂ O ₃	Gd ₂ O ₃	Ho ₂ O ₃	Lu ₂ O ₃	Tb ₂ O ₃	Tm ₂ O ₃	Yb ₂ O ₃
Dy ₂ O ₃	1.00	0.93	0.95	0.55	0.54	0.66	0.89	0.95
Er ₂ O ₃		1.00	0.85	0.57	0.58	0.70	0.91	0.97
Gd ₂ O ₃			1.00	0.51	0.53	0.60	0.86	0.91
Ho ₂ O ₃				1.00	0.37	0.48	0.60	0.56
Lu ₂ O ₃					1.00	0.49	0.53	0.57
Tb ₂ O ₃						1.00	0.64	0.67
Tm ₂ O ₃							1.00	0.93
Yb ₂ O ₃								1.00

		Image: strate SMMLES: TLRED 0.000 <= < 1000.0 2500000 <= < 2500.0 3500.000 <= < 4500.0 5000.000 <= < 5500.0 5000.000 <= < 5500.0 5000.000 <= < 1000.0 Image: strate Image: strate Image: strate Image: strate	
Prepared by pincock, allen & holt 165 S. Union Boulevard, Suite 950 Lakewood, Colorado 80228 Phone (303) 986-6950 Project No. DE-00289	Drawing Provided by/Prepared for Sangra Moller Project Name Pea Ridge Tailings	FIGURE 3-1 LREE 3D Distribution)ate of Issue Aug. 2012 Drawing Name Fig.3-1.dwg

		<pre>SAMPLES : T 0.000 <= 0 200.000 <= 0 300.000 <= 0 300.000 <= 0 300.000 <= 0 300.000 <= 0 600.000 <= 0 600.000 <= 0 400.000 <= 0 400.0000 <= 0 400.00000 <= 0 400.00000 <= 0 400.00000 <= 0 400.00000 <= 0 400.000000000000000000000000000000000</pre>	HREO 200.000 300.000 400.000 500.000 600.000 1000.000
Prepared by pincock, allen & hold 165 S. Union Boulevard, Suit Lakewood, Colorado 80228 Phone (303) 986-6950 Project No. DE-00289	e 950 Drawing Provided by/Prepared for Sangra Moller Project Name Pea Ridge Tailings	FIGURE 3-2 HREE 3D Distribution	Date of Issue Aug. 2012 Drawing Name Fig.3-2.dwg

TABLE 3-5 Sangra Moller Pea Ridge Tailings, Resource Estimate Cross-Correlation Matrix of LREE - HREE

	Y ₂ O ₃	Dy ₂ O ₃	Er ₂ O ₃	Gd ₂ O ₃	Ho ₂ O ₃	Lu ₂ O ₃	Tb ₂ O ₃	Tm ₂ O ₃	Yb ₂ O ₃	Р
Ce ₂ O ₃	0.85	0.84	0.83	0.83	0.46	0.56	0.59	0.76	0.85	0.66
Eu ₂ O ₃	0.87	0.95	0.93	0.92	0.53	0.54	0.66	0.87	0.95	0.66
La ₂ O ₃	0.80	0.79	0.79	0.78	0.43	0.54	0.55	0.71	0.80	0.63
Nd ₂ O ₃	0.92	0.84	0.80	0.86	0.45	0.49	0.56	0.78	0.84	0.64
Pr ₂ O ₃	0.90	0.83	0.79	0.84	0.44	0.50	0.55	0.79	0.83	0.63
Sm ₂ O ₃	0.78	0.75	0.77	0.77	0.44	0.45	0.53	0.73	0.79	0.54
Y ₂ O ₃	1.00	0.90	0.88	0.88	0.51	0.52	0.61	0.87	0.90	0.64

A co-kriging could be executed because of the high coefficient correlations among REO and REO-Apatite; however, PAH estimated the total LREO and HREO due to the scope of this model.

The REO correlations are high enough to be modeled together. An average ratio between them could then be assumed from the composite means.

4.0 ESTIMATION

In spite of some continuity in both levels of the elements in to the settling pond deposition, ordinary kriging (OK) was chosen as the interpolator of the all variables, and thus assuring unbiased results. An almost isotropic horizontal continuity model was fitted in the variograms, together with a short vertical range. Figures 4-1 and 4-2 show the correlograms of TFe in the upper and lower levels.

Ordinary Kriging of TFe, SAT and S was executed in two passes with a minimum of two drill holes in both cases. The minimum and maximum samples were established as 4 and 10, respectively. The first pass used a search ellipsoid of 300-200-15 ft and the second pass used 350-270-15 ft. TFe and SAT major axis orientation was 0° of azimuth, while S major axis azimuth was 60°.

Apatite, LREO and HREO were estimated in one pass using 6 minimum and 12 maximum samples. Ellipsoid orientation was established at 0° of azimuth for the major axis and search distances in 250-100-30, 300-200-15, and 400-350-15, respectively. Any non-estimated block after these two passes was filled with the mean value.

Nearest neighbor (NN) TFe estimation was made to compare, through swath plots, with the kriging values, NN's estimation parameters were the same as the Kriging parameters. Swath plots were generated using 100 ft wide vertical slices and 10 ft wide horizontal slices; they are shown in the next graphs (Figures 4-3 to 4-6). Swath plots show that ordinary Kriging (TFe OK) is unbiased with respect nearest neighbor estimation (TFe, NN), in both units, the upper magnetic and the lower low magnetic levels. Validation of SAT, S, Apatite, LREO, and HREO were done on screen by comparison between blocks and samples values. The summary by domain is shown in Table 4-1. Differences between samples and blocks are less than 5 percent with the exception of SAT.

TABLE 4-1 Sangra Moller Pea Ridge Tailings, Resource Estimate Summary by Domain

Domoin	Variable	Mean					
Domain	variable	10 ft Com	Blocks	Difference			
	TFe (%)	19.0	19.6	3.1%			
	S (%)	0.11	0.111	0.9%			
A11	SAT (%)	3.14	3.39	7.3%			
ALL	Apatite (%)	10.0	9.96	-0.4%			
	LREO (ppm)	4,008	4,001	-0.2%			
	HREO (ppm)	333	331	-0.6%			
	TFe (%)	25.98	26.80	3.1%			
Upper zone	S (%)	0.115	0.111	-3.6%			
	SAT (%)	5.77	6.08	5.0%			
	TFe (%)	15.6	15.7	0.6%			
Lower zone	S (%)	0.112	0.111	-0.9%			
	SAT (%)	1.78	1.91	6.8%			













5.0 DENSITY

The density database contains 382 density measurements of samples of the recovered tailings. The density varies from 2.68 to 4.16 and presents a strong correlation with Fe concentration (Table 5-1 and Figure 5-1).

TABLE 5-1 Sangra Moller Pea Ridge Tailings, Resource Estimate Density Statistics

	Density					
	ALL	Lower Zone				
Ν	382	154	199			
Mean	3.26	3.44	3.12			
Min	2.68	2.71	2.69			
Max	4.16	4.16	3.93			
Variance	0.07	0.05	0.04			
Q1	3.04	3.28	2.99			
Median	3.19	3.45	3.09			
Q3	3.44	3.59	3.20			

There is an important difference between the upper and lower level in the density values which is consistent with the iron gradation.

Density continuity was fitted similar to TFe continuity; it was interpolated using ordinary kriging to reproduce the local variability in both levels. Two passes were performed to estimate density; the mean of each level was assigned to the rest of the non-estimated blocks.

Density-TFe correlation was validated in the block model as it is shown in the next graph (Figure 5-2) of the upper level. Blocks have a good density-TFe correlation similar to the samples correlation.





6.0 RESULTS

The sub-block model was regularized to 50 by 50 by 10 ft block model. This model contains TFe, SAT, S, Apatite, Y_2O_3 , LREO, and HREO. The next two figures (Figures 6-1 and 6-2) correspond to TFe plans of upper and lower level, respectively.

Table 6-1 shows the result of the estimation.

TABLE 6-1 Sangra Moller Pea Ridge Tailings, Resource Estimate Results of Estimation

Cutoff	FeT (%)	Short Tons	Fe (M lb)	% Fe (Mag)	S (%)	LREO (ppm)	HREO (ppm)	Y₂O₃ (ppm)	Apatite (%)
0	19.8	27,216,513	10,772.3	3.430	0.110	3,953	328	648.1	10.0
10	19.8	27,093,313	10,745.2	3.440	0.110	3,952	328	647.8	10.0
25	27.9	8,233,827	4,586.2	6.120	0.110	3,609	284	556.2	9.7



