

# **MAMMOTH GEOLOGICAL LTD.**

2446 Bidston Road  
Mill Bay, B.C. Canada V0R 2P4

Phone : (250) 743-8228 Fax : (250) 743-4430  
email : mammothgeo@shaw.ca

43-101 TECHNICAL REPORT

SE UTAH MAG URANIUM PROJECT  
Located in San Juan County, Utah

FOR

**Anfield Resources Inc.**  
608 - 1199 West Pender Street  
Vancouver, B.C. V6E 2R1

By: R.Tim Henneberry, P.Geol.  
December 24, 2013

The SE Utah Mag Uranium Project consists of 25 claim groups totaling 109 claims clustered throughout San Juan County in southeast Utah, United States. Anfield Resources Inc. is earning a 100% interest in the 25 claim groups by making cash payments of \$600,000 and share issuances of 1,500,000 over the next 36 months. The claim groups are for the most part road accessible from the towns of Moab, Monticello and Blanding.

The 25 claim groups are clustered in four known uranium producing districts: Moab - 5 claim groups; Dry Valley - 4 claim groups; Montezuma Canyon - 8 claim groups, all targeting the uraniferous Salt Wash Sandstone in the Jurassic Morrison Formation; and White Canyon - 8 claim groups targeting the Moss Back Member in the northeast and the Shinarump Member in the west, both uraniferous and found in the Triassic Chinle Formation.

Uranium mineralization in the Salt Wash Sandstone is associated with abundant carbonaceous matter within the thicker sandstone lenses with the overall sandstone. Historic ore bodies range from 1.5 metres thick and 61 metres long in the Moab District through about 6 to 12 metres in length, 3 to 6 metres in width, and 1.2 to 3 metres in thickness in the Montezuma Canyon District to 1 metre by 9 metres by 61 metres in the Dry Valley District. Average historic grades range from 0.18 percent  $U_3O_8$  and 1.35 percent  $V_2O_5$  in Dry Valley through 0.24 percent  $U_3O_8$  and 0.31 percent  $V_2O_5$  in Montezuma Canyon to 0.29 percent  $U_3O_8$  and 0.15 percent  $V_2O_5$  in Moab.

Uranium mineralization in the Moss Back Member is associated with abundant carbonaceous matter in basal sandstone lenses. Historic ore bodies range from 91 to 152 metres in length, 15 to 45 metres in width and 60 centimetres to 3 metres in thickness. Historic average grades are 0.26 percent  $U_3O_8$  and 0.06 percent  $V_2O_5$ .

Uranium mineralization in the Shinarump Member is associated with abundant carbonaceous matter in basal sandstone lenses. Historic ore bodies range from 15 to 305 metres in length, 3 to 150 metres in width and centimetres to 3 metres in thickness, though most average 1 metre in thickness. Historic average grades for these deposits were not documented.

The presence of ore bodies and mineralization within the four uranium districts is not necessarily indicative of the presence of the ore bodies and mineralization on the specific Anfield claim groups. However, the presence of known uranium bearing formations on the 25 claim groups, combined with historical workings on the majority of the claim groups make the Anfield SE Utah Mag Uranium project a project of merit.

A program of preliminary exploration in advance of drilling is recommended. This program should consist of historical research on workings on each of the 25 claim group, including: historical production, sampling, and drilling. This should be followed by field verification in advance of reverse circulation and/or diamond drilling. The historical research budget is estimated to cost \$50,000.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	5
RELIANCE ON OTHER EXPERTS .....	5
PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION .....	7
ACCESSIBILITY, CLIMATE, LOCAL RESOURCES, INFRASTRUCTURE AND PHYSIOGRAPHY .....	18
HISTORY .....	21
GEOLOGICAL SETTING AND MINERALIZATION .....	29
Chinle Formation .....	30
Formations beneath the Chinle Formation.....	33
Morrison Formation .....	33
Moab District Geology and Mineralization .....	35
Dry Valley District Geology and Mineralization.....	37
Montezuma Canyon District Geology and Mineralization.....	40
White Canyon District Geology and Mineralization .....	45
DEPOSIT TYPES .....	53
EXPLORATION .....	54
DRILLING .....	55
SAMPLE PREPARATION, ANALYSES AND SECURITY .....	55
DATA VERIFICATION .....	55
MINERAL PROCESSING AND METALLURGICAL TESTING .....	55
MINERAL RESOURCES AND MINERAL RESERVE ESTIMATES.....	55
ADJACENT PROPERTIES.....	56
OTHER RELEVANT DATA AND INFORMATION .....	56
INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	56
RECOMMENDATIONS .....	58
REFERENCES.....	59
CERTIFICATE R. TIMOTHY HENNEBERRY .....	60

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1a. Summary of Moab District Group .....	7
Table 1b. List of Federal BLM Tenures in the Moab District .....	8
Table 1c. Summary of Dry Valley District Groups.....	10
Table 1d. List of Federal BLM Tenures in the Dry Valley District.....	10
Table 1e. Summary of Montezuma Canyon District Groups .....	11
Table 1f. List of Federal BLM Tenures in the Montezuma Canyon District .....	12
Table 1g. Summary of White Canyon District Groups.....	14
Table 1h. List of Federal BLM Tenures in the White Canyon District.....	14
Table 2. Anfield Resources Inc. MAG Uranium Project Agreement Terms .....	17
Table 3a. Moab District MRDS Summaries .....	22
Table 3b. Dry Valley District MRDS Summaries.....	24
Table 3c. Montezuma Canyon District MRDS Summaries .....	27
Table 3d. White Canyon District MRDS Summaries .....	28
Table 4. Historical Research Budget.....	58

-4-  
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Location Map .....	6
Figure 2a. North Moab District Claims.....	7
Figure 2b. South Moab District Claims.....	9
Figure 2c. Dry Valley District Claims .....	9
Figure 2d. Montezuma Canyon District Claims North .....	11
Figure 2e. Montezuma Canyon District Claims Central .....	13
Figure 2f. Montezuma Canyon District Claims South.....	13
Figure 2g. White Canyon District Claims North .....	15
Figure 2h. White Canyon District Claims South .....	15
Figure 2i. White Canyon District Claims West.....	16
Figure 2j. White Canyon District Claims Far West .....	16
Figure 3. Regional Geology .....	30
Figure 4. Chinle and Morrison Formations.....	34
Figure 5. Moab Groups Morrison Formation Geology.....	36
Figure 6. Dry Valley District Morrison Formation Geology .....	38
Figure 7a. Montezuma Canyon North Groups Morrison Formation Geology .....	41
Figure 7b. Montezuma Canyon Central Groups Morrison Formation Geology .....	42
Figure 7. Montezuma Canyon South Groups Morrison Formation Geology .....	45
Figure 8a. White Canyon North Groups Chinle Formation Geology .....	47
Figure 8b. White Canyon Central Groups Chinle Formation Geology .....	48
Figure 8c. White Canyon West Groups Chinle Formation Geology.....	49
Figure 8d. White Canyon Far West Groups Chinle Formation Geology .....	50

LIST OF PLATES

Plate 1. Uraniferous Log at YCG Group Adit, Moab District .....	23
Plate 2. Uraniferous Carbonaceous Trash at Bee Adit, Dry Valley District.....	25
Plate 3. YCS Group .....	37
Plate 4. BEE Group .....	39
Plate 5. NON Group .....	39
Plate 6. FA Group .....	43
Plate 7. LB Group .....	44
Plate 8. CW Group .....	44
Plate 9. DX Group .....	46
Plate 10. CG Group .....	50
Plate 11. HN and SW Groups .....	52
Plate 12. LL Group .....	53

The purpose of this Technical Report is to support the Anfield Resources Inc. News Release dated October 30, 2013 announcing the acquisition of the Mag Uranium Project in southeast Utah. This report was commissioned by Mr. Corey Dias, the CEO of Anfield Resources Inc.

In preparing this report, the author referred to geological reports listed in the References Section, the property data provided to him by Mag Exploration Services Inc., the property vendor, and on his years of extensive mineral exploration experience in the western Cordillera.

The author visited some, but not all, of the individual 25 properties comprising the Mag Uranium Project between November 21 and November 23, 2013. The author concentrated on visiting the individual properties that had significant historical workings in order to gain an understanding of the overall project and the geology and the potential of the uranium districts within which the individual claim blocks are located. The visit was further hampered by a severe snowstorm that unfortunately coincided with the property tour. The vendor took photos of all workings located during the actual staking of the claim blocks has relied on these photos, in combination with the federal and state geological reports on the area, for the claim blocks he was unable to visit.

While the stratigraphy and uranium geology and mineralization for all of the districts in southeast Utah is well documented (Doelling, 1974) for instance, there is extremely limited data available for the individual claim blocks, despite the rather significant workings located on a number of them. Therefore, the author has discussed the geology and type mineralization of each of the uranium districts in which the claims are located and then documented the workings either personally visited or located by Mag Exploration Services Inc. personnel.

#### RELIANCE ON OTHER EXPERTS

The author is not relying on a report or opinion of any experts. The ownership of the property claims has been taken from the United States Bureau of Land Management LR2000 online database, last checked December 7, 2013.