R. E. Adams, Administrative Officer, DMEA
Attention - Docket and Control Branch

June 30, 1952

Iron and Ferro-Alloy Division, DMEA

Mining -
Date
JUL
BUREAU
Denver, Colo.

Removal of application from active file
Docket No. DMA 1856X - Tungsten
E. L. Ming
Black Rock Claims
Mohave County, Arizona

In the attached correspondence, the applicant requests that his application be withdrawn. The docket has accordingly been removed from the active files of this Division and is forwarded herewith.

George C. Selfridge

G. C. Selfridge, Chief
Iron and Ferro-Alloy Division

Attachment

LSeett'lm
6/30/52

cc: Adm. Reading File
Docket
R. W. Gechan, USBM
D. M. Lemmon, USGS
Field Team Reg. IV
Operating Committee
G. C. Selfridge

W.H.K.

JFS

224 New Customhouse
Denver 2, Colorado

June 25, 1952

Memorandum

To: Secretary to the Operating Committee
Defense Minerals Exploration Administration

From: Executive Officer, Field Team, Region IV

Subject: DMA Docket 1886X, E. L. Ming, Black Rock Tungsten Prospect, Mohave County, Arizona

Enclosed are four copies of a letter from E. L. Ming stating that he would like to withdraw his application for exploration assistance, Docket DMA 1886.

Also enclosed are four copies of an engineering report by L. L. Farnham, Mining Engineer, U. S. Bureau of Mines.

W. H. King
W. H. King

Enclosures
JFS:lá JFS

cc: Docket, chron.
Koschmann
Storme

JFS

Mining Division
Region IV

June 25, 1952

Memorandum

To: A. H. Koschmann

From: Executive Officer, Field Team, Region IV

Subject: DMA Docket 1886X, E. L. Ming, Black Rock Tungsten Prospect, Mohave County, Arizona

Enclosed are two copies of a letter from E. L. Ming requesting us to withdraw his application for exploration assistance, DMA 1886. Also enclosed are two copies of an engineering report by L. L. Farnham.

W. H. King

W. H. King

Enclosures

JFS:ld

cc Docket, chron.

E. L. MING
HACKBERRY, ARIZONA

May 26, 1952

Walter R. Storms
U. S. Bureau of Mines
University Station
Tucson, Arizona

Dear Mr. Storms:

I would like to notify you of my desire to withdraw my application for an exploration loan on my Black Rock tungsten claims, DMA Docket 1886.

I appreciate all you have done in aiding me in the above matter and hope I have not caused too much inconvience to you or your department.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. Ming

E. L. Ming

Re: DMA Docket 1886,
Black Rock Tungsten Claims,
Cottonwood Mining District,
Mohave County, Arizona

U. S. BUREAU OF MINES
MINING DIVISION
MAY 28 1952
TUCSON, ARIZONA

E. L. Ming
HACKBERRY, ARIZONA

May 26, 1952

Walter R. Storms
U. S. Bureau of Mines
University Station
Tucson, Arizona

Dear Mr. Storms:

I would like to notify you of my desire to withdraw my application for an exploration loan on my Black Rock tungsten claims, DMA Docket 1886.

I appreciate all you have done in aiding me in the above matter and hope I have not caused too much inconvenience to you or your department.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ E. L. Ming

Re: DMA Docket 1886,
Black Rock Tungsten Claims,
Cottonwood Mining District,
Mohave County, Ariz.

C O P Y

Mining Division
Date Rec'd.

JUN 20 1952

BUREAU OF MINES
Denver, Colorado

MINING DIVISION
REGION IV

June 19, 1952

Memorandum

To : W. H. King, Acting Chief, Mining Div., Region IV

From : Chief, Arizona-New Mexico Dr., Mining Div., Region IV

Subject : EMA Docket 18864, E. L. King's Black Rock Tungsten Prospect, Mohave County, Ariz.

Enclosed is a letter from E. L. King, asking that his application for an exploration loan on the Black Rock tungsten claims be cancelled.

Also enclosed are original and 8 copies of a short report by L. L. Farnham of the Bureau of Mines. I don't believe a separate report will be submitted by the Geological Survey as the loan application has been withdrawn. Farnham's report is merely information for the files.

Brochure is enclosed.

Walter R. Storms

Walter R. Storms

cc W. H. King (8)
EMA-1836
MF

WRStorms:frj

DMA-1886, L. L. MEND'S BLACK ROCK TUNGSTEN PROSPECT
MOHAVE COUNTY, ARIZ.

Engineering Report

By L. L. Farnham
Mining Engineer
U. S. Bureau of Mines

June 1952

DEKA-1886, E. L. MIKO'S BLACK ROCK TUNGSTEN PROSPECT
MOHAVE COUNTY, ARIZ.

CONTENTS

Engineering report	Page
Introduction	1
Acknowledgment	1
Location and Physical features	1
History and production	2
Ownership and extent	2
Description of the deposits	2
Conclusions	4

INTRODUCTION

In June 1951, E. L. Ming of Hackberry, Ariz. applied to the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration for an exploration loan amounting to $20,000. The application was docketed as DMEA-1880. The requested loan was to be used for the further exploration of a tungsten prospect. The property was visited by the examining team[1/] during the week of May 12, 1952.

Early in June the applicant formally withdrew his application for exploration aid.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgment is made to E. L. Ming for his assistance during the examination of the property.

LOCATION AND PHYSICAL FEATURES

The claims are situated in the Cottonwood Cliffs area about 16.5 miles southeast of Hackberry, Mohave County, Ariz. The property can be reached by driving eastward from the Hackberry store on U. S. Highway 66 for 1 mile to the junction of the Wickieup road, thence south on this graded road for 6.7 miles to a side road. Proceed on the left branch for 2.8 miles to an electric power line, follow the power line road eastward for 3.7 miles to a dim road branching left, then continue on this road for 2.3 miles to a steel water tank. The southern workings on the property are about a quarter of a mile east of this water tank.

The area surrounding the property is moderately rugged and lies at an altitude of about 5,000 feet above sea level.

1/ L. L. Farnham of the Bureau of Mines
C. S. Bromfield of the Geological Survey

HISTORY AND PRODUCTION

The presence of scheelite was detected in the area by the aid of ultra-violet light in 1950. Since that time only a limited amount of prospecting has been done and no production has been made.

OWNERSHIP AND EXTENT

The property belonging to the applicant consists of 4 contiguous unpatented claims known as the Black Rock Group.

DESCRIPTION OF THE DEPOSITS

Tungsten mineralization was found on the claims in two rather widely separated areas. Both occurrences were small, scattered, irregular disseminations of scheelite in pre-Cambrian schist. The schists form a wide and extensive belt which is flanked on both sides by granitic rocks. Pegmatites intrude both the granites and schists.

On the southern claim a small inclined (45°) shaft has followed a narrow zone of mineralization to a depth of about 25 feet. Under ultra-violet light, specks of finely divided scheelite were observed scattered over widths of several feet but the bulk of the mineral was confined to spots not more than 12 inches wide. These better spots appeared to be associated with minor shears that followed the foliation of the schist. Little or no vein quartz accompanied the scheelite.

On the surface the lateral extent of the tungsten mineralization was evidently limited to a few tens of feet.

The results of 2 samples taken by the examiners across the most highly fluorescent spots exposed in the incline were as follows:

Number	Width	Location	Percent WO_3
12625	12 inches	Bottom of incline	0.05
12626	12 inches	12 ft. below collar of incline	1.10

From the material broken during the course of sinking the incline, the applicant had sorted about 3,500 pounds of ore. The most of this had been placed in sacks and still remained at the shaft site. A grab sample of nut-size pieces, taken at random from the top of 6 of these sacks of ore, showed upon analysis, 0.42 percent WO_3.

This deposit, in view of its limited extent and indicated grade, would not appear to be of commercial interest.

The other tungsten bearing area on the property was about three-quarters of a mile north of the incline. There only a few shallow trenches had been made at the spots showing the best fluorescence. According to the applicant, scheelite was visible under the ultra-violet light in irregular scattered spots over a surface area some 200 feet long and as much as 20 feet wide. As in the southern occurrence the tungsten mineralization was found disseminated in, and apparently restricted to a band of dark

hornblende schist. No semblance of a vein or other continuously mineralized structure was evident nor was scheelite recognized in the area by the unaided eye. Samples were collected at many of the "hot spots", as designated by the applicant, but when these were observed under a mineral light they showed so little scheelite that they were not considered worthy of analysis.

No doubt sporadic tungsten mineralization exists in this area but the individual occurrences were small, low-grade and lacked continuity.

CONCLUSIONS

The tungsten mineralization exposed in the two areas on the Black Rock claims does not appear promising. Due to the limited size and grade relationship of the sporadic occurrences, there is little likelihood that further exploration would result in a significant discovery of tungsten ore.

Mining Division
Date Rec'd.

JUN 20 1952

BUREAU OF MINES
Denver, Colorado

MINING DIVISION
REGION IV

June 19, 1952

Memorandum

To : G. L. King, Acting Chief, Mining Div., Region IV

From : Chief, Arizona-New Mexico Br., Mining Div., Region IV

Subject : DMA Docket 1880A, L. L. King's Black Rock Tungsten Prospect, Mohave County, Ariz.

Enclosed is a letter from L. L. King, asking that his application for an exploration loan on the Black Rock tungsten claims be cancelled.

Also enclosed are original and 6 copies of a short report by L. L. Farnham of the Bureau of Mines. I don't believe a separate report will be submitted by the Geological Survey as the loan application has been withdrawn. Farnham's report is merely information for the files.

Brochure is enclosed.

Walter R. Storms

Walter R. Storms

cc W. H. King (6)
DMA-1880
MP

WRStorms:frj

DMA-1880, C. L. MEIO'S BLACK ROCK TUNGSTEN PROSPECT
MOHAVE COUNTY, ARIZ.

Engineering Report

By L. L. Farnham
Mining Engineer
U. S. Bureau of Mines

June 1952

DMA-1886, E. L. MIKO'S BLACK ROCK TUNGSTEN PROSPECT
MOHAVE COUNTY, ARIZ.

CONTENTS

Engineering report	Page
Introduction	1
Acknowledgment	1
Location and physical features	1
History and production	2
Ownership and extent	2
Description of the deposits	2
Conclusions	4

INTRODUCTION

In June 1951, E. L. Ming of Hackberry, Ariz. applied to the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration for an exploration loan amounting to $20,000. The application was docketed as DMA-1880. The requested loan was to be used for the further exploration of a tungsten prospect. The property was visited by the examining team[1/] during the week of May 12, 1952.

Early in June the applicant formally withdrew his application for exploration aid.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgment is made to E. L. Ming for his assistance during the examination of the property.

LOCATION AND PHYSICAL FEATURES

The claims are situated in the Cottonwood Cliffs area about 16.5 miles southeast of Hackberry, Mohave County, Ariz. The property can be reached by driving eastward from the Hackberry store on U. S. Highway 66 for 1 mile to the junction of the Wickieup road, thence south on this graded road for 6.7 miles to a side road. Proceed on the left branch for 2.6 miles to an electric power line, follow the power line road eastward for 3.7 miles to a dim road branching left, then continue on this road for 2.3 miles to a steel water tank. The southern workings on the property are about a quarter of a mile east of this water tank.

The area surrounding the property is moderately rugged and lies at an altitude of about 5,000 feet above sea level.

1/ L. L. Farnham of the Bureau of Mines
C. S. Bromfield of the Geological Survey

HISTORY AND PRODUCTION

The presence of scheelite was detected in the area by the aid of ultra-violet light in 1950. Since that time only a limited amount of prospecting has been done and no production has been made.

OWNERSHIP AND EXTENT

The property belonging to the applicant consists of 4 contiguous unpatented claims known as the Black Lock Group.

DESCRIPTION OF THE DEPOSITS

Tungsten mineralization was found on the claims in two rather widely separated areas. Both occurrences were small, scattered, irregular disseminations of scheelite in pre-Cambrian schist. The schists form a wide and extensive belt which is flanked on both sides by granitic rocks. Pegmatites intrude both the granites and schists.

On the southern claim a small inclined (45^{0}) shaft has followed a narrow zone of mineralization to a depth of about 25 feet. Under ultra-violet light, specks of finely divided scheelite were observed scattered over widths of several feet but the bulk of the mineral was confined to spots not more than 12 inches wide. These better spots appeared to be associated with minor shears that followed the foliation of the schist. Little or no vein quartz accompanied the scheelite.

On the surface the lateral extent of the tungsten mineralization was evidently limited to a few tens of feet.

The results of 2 samples taken by the examiners across the most highly fluorescent spots exposed in the incline were as follows:

Number	Width	Location	Percent WO_3
12625	12 inches	Bottom of incline	0.05
12626	12 inches	12 ft. below collar of incline	1.10

From the material broken during the course of sinking the incline, the applicant had sorted about 3,500 pounds of ore. The most of this had been placed in sacks and still remained at the shaft site. A grab sample of nut-size pieces, taken at random from the top of 6 of these sacks of ore, showed upon analysis, 0.42 percent WO_3.

This deposit, in view of its limited extent and indicated grade, would not appear to be of commercial interest.

The other tungsten bearing area on the property was about three-quarters of a mile north of the incline. There only a few shallow trenches had been made at the spots showing the best fluorescence. According to the applicant, scheelite was visible under the ultra-violet light in irregular scattered spots over a surface area some 200 feet long and as much as 20 feet wide. As in the southern occurrence the tungsten mineralization was found disseminated in, and apparently restricted to a band of dark

hornblende schist. No semblance of a vein or other continuously mineralized structure was evident nor was scheelite recognized in the area by the unaided eye. Samples were collected at many of the "hot spots", as designated by the applicant, but when these were observed under a mineral light they showed so little scheelite that they were not considered worthy of analysis.

No doubt sporadic tungsten mineralization exists in this area but the individual occurrences were small, low-grade and lacked continuity.

CONCLUSIONS

The tungsten mineralization exposed in the two areas on the Black Rock claims does not appear promising. Due to the limited size and grade relationship of the sporadic occurrences, there is little likelihood that further exploration would result in a significant discovery of tungsten ore.

Mining Division
Date Rec'd.

JUN 20 1952

BUREAU OF MINES
Denver, Colorado

MINING DIVISION
REGION IV

June 19, 1952

Memorandum

To : W. L. King, Acting Chief, Mining Div., Region IV

From : Chief, Arizona-New Mexico Br., Mining Div., Region IV

Subject : EXA Docket 1696A, W. L. King's Black Rock Tungsten Prospect, Mohave County, Ariz.

Enclosed is a letter from W. L. King, asking that his application for an exploration loan on the Black Rock tungsten claims be cancelled.

Also enclosed are original and 6 copies of a short report by L. L. Farnham of the Bureau of Mines. I don't believe a separate report will be submitted by the Geological Survey as the loan application has been withdrawn. Farnham's report is merely information for the files.

Brochure is enclosed.

Walter R. Storms

Walter R. Storms

cc: W. L. King (6)
EXA-1696
EF

WRStorms:fr

DMA-1850, D. L. MEID'S BLACK ROCK TUNGSTEN PROSPECT
MOHAVE COUNTY, ARIZ.

Engineering Report

By L. L. Fanning
Mining Engineer
U. S. Bureau of Mines

June 1952

DMA-1886, E. L. MING'S BLACK ROCK TUNGSTEN PROSPECT
MOHAVE COUNTY, ARIZ.

CONTENTS

Engineering report	Page
Introduction	1
Acknowledgment	1
Location and Physical features	1
History and production	2
Ownership and extent	2
Description of the deposits	2
Conclusions	4

INTRODUCTION

In June 1951, D. L. Ming of Hackberry, Ariz. applied to the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration for an exploration loan amounting to $20,000. The application was docketed as DMEA-1836. The requested loan was to be used for the further exploration of a tungsten prospect. The property was visited by the examining team 1/ during the week of May 12, 1952.

Early in June the applicant formally withdrew his application for exploration aid.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgment is made to D. L. Ming for his assistance during the examination of the property.

LOCATION AND PHYSICAL FEATURES

The claims are situated in the Cottonwood Cliffs area about 16.5 miles southeast of Hackberry, Mohave County, Ariz. The property can be reached by driving eastward from the Hackberry store on U. S. Highway 66 for 1 mile to the junction of the Wickieup road, thence south on this graded road for 6.7 miles to a side road. Proceed on the left branch for 2.6 miles to an electric power line, follow the power line road eastward for 3.7 miles to a dim road branching left, then continue on this road for 2.3 miles to a steel water tank. The southern workings on the property are about a quarter of a mile east of this water tank.

The area surrounding the property is moderately rugged and lies at an altitude of about 5,000 feet above sea level.

1/ L. L. Farnham of the Bureau of Mines
S. S. Brownfield of the Geological Survey

HISTORY AND PRODUCTION

The presence of scheelite was detected in the area by the aid of ultra-violet light in 1950. Since that time only a limited amount of prospecting has been done and no production has been made.

OWNERSHIP AND EXTENT

The property belonging to the applicant consists of 4 contiguous unpatented claims known as the Black Rock Group.

DESCRIPTION OF THE DEPOSITS

Tungsten mineralization was found on the claims in two rather widely separated areas. Both occurrences were small, scattered, irregular disseminations of scheelite in pre-Cambrian schist. The schists form a wide and extensive belt which is flanked on both sides by granitic rocks. Pegmatites intrude both the granites and schists.

On the southern claim a small inclined (45°) shaft has followed a narrow zone of mineralization to a depth of about 25 feet. Under ultra-violet light, specks of finely divided scheelite were observed scattered over widths of several feet but the bulk of the mineral was confined to spots not more than 12 inches wide. These better spots appeared to be associated with minor shears that followed the foliation of the schist. Little or no vein quartz accompanied the scheelite.

On the surface the lateral extent of the tungsten mineralization was evidently limited to a few tens of feet.

The results of 2 samples taken by the examiners across the most highly fluorescent spots exposed in the incline were as follows:

Number	Width	Location	Percent WO_3
12625	12 inches	Bottom of incline	0.05
12626	12 inches	12 ft. below collar of incline	1.10

From the material broken during the course of sinking the incline, the applicant had sorted about 3,500 pounds of ore. The most of this had been placed in sacks and still remained at the shaft site. A grab sample of nut-size pieces, taken at random from the top of 6 of these sacks of ore, showed upon analysis, 0.42 percent WO_3.

This deposit, in view of its limited extent and indicated grade, would not appear to be of commercial interest.

The other tungsten bearing area on the property was about three-quarters of a mile north of the incline. There only a few shallow trenches had been made at the spots showing the best fluorescence. According to the applicant, scheelite was visible under the ultra-violet light in irregular scattered spots over a surface area some 200 feet long and as much as 20 feet wide. As in the southern occurrence the tungsten mineralization was found disseminated in, and apparently restricted to a band of dark

hornblende schist. No semblance of a vein or other continuously mineralized structure was evident nor was scheelite recognized in the area by the unaided eye. Samples were collected at many of the "hot spots", as designated by the applicant, but when these were observed under a mineral light they showed so little scheelite that they were not considered worthy of analysis.

No doubt sporadic tungsten mineralization exists in this area but the individual occurrences were small, low-grade and lacked continuity.

CONCLUSIONS

The tungsten mineralization exposed in the two areas on the Black Rock claims does not appear promising. Due to the limited size and grade relationship of the sporadic occurrences, there is little likelihood that further exploration would result in a significant discovery of tungsten ore.

Mining Division
Date Rec'd.
JUN 3 - 1952
BUREAU OF MINES
Denver, Colorado

MINING DIVISION
REGION IV

May 28, 1952

Re: DMA Docket 1886, Black Rock Tungsten Claims, Mohave Co., Ariz.

Mr. E. L. Ming
Hackberry, Ariz.

My dear Mr. Ming:

Thank you for your letter of May 26, asking that your application for an exploration loan on your Black Rock tungsten claims be withdrawn.

Your letter and application will be forwarded to the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration for cancellation of your application.

Sincerely yours,

Walter R. Storms, Chief
Arizona-New Mexico Branch

CC W. H. King
DMA-1886
DF

WRStorms:frj

Mining Division
Date Rec'd.
MAY 8 - 1952
BUREAU OF MINES
Denver, Colorado

W.H.K.

MINING DIVISION
REGION IV

May 6, 1952

Re: DMA Docket 1886,
Black Rock Tungsten
Claims, Cottonwood
Mining District,
Mohave County, Ariz.

Mr. E. L. Ming
Hackberry, Arizona

My dear Mr. Ming:

The Defense Minerals Exploration Administration has requested this office to have an examination made of your Black Rock tungsten claims upon which you applied for an exploration loan in 1951, DMA Docket 1886.

We expect to have an examining team, consisting of Mr. L. L. Farnham of the Bureau of Mines and Mr. C. S. Bromfield of the Geological Survey, in the Kingman area next week. While in that locality they will contact you and visit your property, probably about May 15.

Please let me know before Monday, May 12, if you can meet our men in Hackberry.

Sincerely yours,

Walter R. Storms, Chief
Arizona-New Mexico Branch

CC W. H King
C. A. Anderson
DMA-1886
DF

WRStorms:frj

224 New Customhouse
Denver 2, Colorado

April 29, 1952

Memorandum

To: W. R. Storms (with brochure)

(Through Acting Chief, Mining Division, Region IV)

C. A. Anderson

From: Field Team, Region IV

Subject: Docket DMEA-1886, E. L. Ming, Tungsten, Black Rock Claims, Mohave County, Arizona

Enclosed herewith is the subject application for Government assistance in exploration work estimated to cost $20,000.

A field examination is required.

Your attention to paragraph 17 of the attached "Review" is requested.

J. F. Shaw for
J. H. East, Jr.

for A. H. Koschmann

Enclosure

HMC:oc
cc: Subject, Chron.
Koschmann (2)

Mr. W. L. Ming
Hackberry,
Arizona

Re: Docket No. DMA 1886X - Tungsten
Black Rock Claims
Mohave County, Arizona

Dear Mr. Ming:

Your application for assistance in exploring the Black Rock claims in Mohave County, Arizona, Docket No. DMA 1886X, with your letter of April 4, 1952, containing additional information and a sketch map has been reviewed by the Iron and Ferro-Alloy Division of the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration and has been referred to Mr. J. H. Faust, Jr., Executive Officer, DMA Field Team, Region IV, 224 New Customhouse Building, Denver 2, Colorado, for a field examination.

The Regional Office will contact you at an early date in regard to the examination of your property. Any assistance that you can render the field team during the examination will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

C. O. Mittendorf

Acting Administrator
Defense Minerals Exploration
Administration

TL/Chapman'lm
4/15/52

cc: Admn. Reading File
Docket
R. W. Geehan, USBM
D. M. Lemmon, USGS
Field Team Reg. IV
O. C. Selfridge
T. L. Chapman
Operating Committee

Field Team Reg. IV

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

4LC
Selfridge
Gerhan
(Sec 4 and 10)
Lemmon

Mr. J. H. East, Jr.
Executive Officer, Region IV
224 New Customhouse Building
Denver 2, Colorado

Dear Sir:

We attach "Review of Application for Exploration Assistance" on:

Applicant E. L. Ming

Docket No. DMEA 1886

Commodity Tungsten

Amount $ 20,000.00

Please expedite consideration of the application with particular reference to the points raised in the attached "Review".

Sincerely yours,

Frank E. Johnson
Chairman, Operating Committee
Defense Minerals Exploration
Administration

APPROVED:

J. H. Hedges
Member, Bureau of Mines

T. P. Thayer
Member, Geological Survey

4-28-52
Only one copy of application was sent from Washington + this was sent to field this date

13759 HMC

Defense Minerals Administration

Review of Application for Exploration Assistance

Docket No. DMA 1886

Commodity Tungsten

Total Amount $20,000.00

Govt. Participation $15,000.00

1. Name and Address of Applicant Mr. E. L. Ming

Hackberry, Arizona

2. Location of Property 8 miles southeast of Hackberry in the Cottonwood Mining District, Mohave County, Arizona. Straddles corner of Sections 9, 10, 15 & 16: T. 22 N.: R. 13 W.

3. Mineral or metal Tungsten Is it listed in Section 9 of MO-5? Yes

If not, application will be rejected.

4. Geologic probability of discovery—based on data in application (question #16, 17, 18, 20 and 22)*

Mines or Survey reports, etc., do you rate chances:

a) Good

b) Poor

c) None

d) Don't know—needs field examination Yes

e) Is there an alternative and favorable project? No (Yes-RWH)
(If so, attach an explanation)
(Surface samples - RWH)

5. Is the applicant's right to the property clearly stated? Yes
(question 5, 6, 7)*

6. If applicant is a lessee, is a copy of the lease attached? -----

Does the lease have sufficient time to run to cover a future productive period? -----

*question numbers are those of MF-103

7. Are subordination agreements necessary? No

a) MF-201? _____

b) MF-202? _____

8. From the data presented, does the proposed project appear feasible from the point of view of:

a) Available manpower Yes

b) Equipment and supplies Yes
(question 14 plus general knowledge of availability)*

c) Accessibility (question 12)* Fair

d) Water (question 13)* Within 1/2 mile of mine

e) Power (question 13)* For project use gasoline or diesel power.

Is a field check needed on any of these points? _____

9. Does the experience of the applicant appear to be adequate to assure that he can properly conduct the proposed project? (question 4)* _____

Is a field check needed on this point? Yes

10. Exhibit A. (question 21 and 22)*

a) Is the project adequately described? Yes (No - R.W.G.)

If not, are there sufficient data given so that you can describe the project? (No - R.W.G.) If so, attach a draft.

b) Is there an adequate map or sketch of the proposed work? No

c) Is the proposed work "exploration" under the definition of Section 8, MO-5? Yes

If not, what part of it is? _____

Is this part a worthwhile exploration project?_____

d) Are the cost estimates detailed? **Partially**

Can they be summarized, as on page 2 of Procedural Instruction 5-A, from the available data?_____ If so, attach a draft.

e) Are the cost estimates reasonable? **Needs investigation.**

f) Should more information be requested from applicant?_____

g) Is a field examination necessary to complete Exhibit A? **Yes**

11. Exhibit B (question 23-d)*

a) Is it applicable? **Yes**

b) If so, are sufficient data furnished?_____ If so, attach a draft.

c) Is a field check needed? **Yes**

12. Exhibit C (question 23-e, f and g)*

a) Is it applicable? **Yes**

b) Sufficient data?_____ If so, attach a draft.

c) Are rents and charges reasonable?_____

d) Is a field check needed? **Yes**

13. Exhibit D (question 23-a, b)*

a) Are there sufficient data? **No**

b) Is the schedule adequate for the work proposed?_____

c) Is the schedule excessive for the work proposed?_____

d) Are the proposed wages and salaries reasonable?_____

e) Is a field check needed? **Yes**

14. Exhibit E (question 23-c)*

a) Is it applicable? No

b) Sufficient data?

c) Reasonable?

d) Field check needed?

15. In your judgment, can the proposed work be done in the proposed time? Should be checked.

(All exploration must be completed within two years)

16. If field examination is not needed, attach your recommendation.

17. If field examination is needed, do you have any special instructions for the field team not indicated by your answers to the foregoing question? Property can be investigated when field team is in area on other investigations. Although the commodity people have no information concerning this particular area, it is felt that the property does not warrant a special trip.

Enclosure:

1 - MF-103

cc: Field Team Reg. IV (2)
Operating Committee
Docket

Reviewed by: T. L. Chapman

Date 4/14/52

Field Team Reg. IV

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

WBB

APR 21

Mr. J. H. East, Jr.
Executive Officer, Region IV
224 New Customhouse Building
Denver 2, Colorado

Dear Sir:

We attach "Review of Application for Exploration Assistance" on:

Applicant E. L. Ming

Docket No. DMEA 1886

Commodity Tungsten

Amount $ 20,000.00

Please expedite consideration of the application with particular reference to the points raised in the attached "Review".

Sincerely yours,

(signed) FRANK E. JOHNSON

Chairman, Operating Committee
Defense Minerals Exploration
Administration

APPROVED:

J. H. Hedges

Member, Bureau of Mines

T. P. Thayer

Member, Geological Survey

13759

Defense Minerals Administration

Review of Application for Exploration Assistance

Docket No. DMA 1886

Commodity Tungsten

Total Amount $20,000.00

Govt. Participation $15,000.00

1. Name and Address of Applicant Mr. E. L. Ming

Hackberry, Arizona

2. Location of Property 8 miles southeast of Hackberry in the Cottonwood Mining District, Mohave County, Arizona. Straddles corner of Sections 9, 10, 15 & 16; T. 22 N.; R. 13 W.

3. Mineral or metal Tungsten Is it listed in Section 9 of MO-5? Yes

If not, application will be rejected.

4. Geologic probability of discovery--based on data in application (question #16, 17, 18, 20 and 22)*

Mines or Survey reports, etc., do you rate chances:

a) Good

b) Poor

c) None

d) Don't know--needs field examination Yes

e) Is there an alternative and favorable project? No (Yes - RWH)
(If so, attach an explanation)
(surface samples - RWH)

5. Is the applicant's right to the property clearly stated? Yes
(question 5, 6, 7)*

6. If applicant is a lessee, is a copy of the lease attached? ----

Does the lease have sufficient time to run to cover a future productive period? ----

*question numbers are those of MF-103

7. Are subordination agreements necessary? **No**

a) MF-201? _____

b) MF-202? _____

8. From the data presented, does the proposed project appear feasible from the point of view of:

a) Available manpower **Yes**

b) Equipment and supplies **Yes**
(question 14 plus general knowledge of availability)*

c) Accessibility (question 12)* **Fair**

d) Water (question 13)* **Within 1/2 mile of mine**

e) Power (question 13)* **For project use gasoline or diesel power.**

Is a field check needed on any of these points? _____

9. Does the experience of the applicant appear to be adequate to assure that he can properly conduct the proposed project? (question 4)* _____

Is a field check needed on this point? **Yes**

10. Exhibit A. (question 21 and 22)*

a) Is the project adequately described? **Yes** (M. - RWH)

If not, are there sufficient data given so that you can describe the project? _____ If so, attach a draft.

b) Is there an adequate map or sketch of the proposed work? **No**

c) Is the proposed work "exploration" under the definition of Section 8, MO-5? **Yes**

If not, what part of it is? _____

Is this part a worthwhile exploration project?_____

d) Are the cost estimates detailed? Partially

Can they be summarized, as on page 2 of Procedural Instruction 5-A, from the available data?_____ If so, attach a draft.

e) Are the cost estimates reasonable? Needs investigation.

f) Should more information be requested from applicant?_____

g) Is a field examination necessary to complete Exhibit A? Yes

11. Exhibit B (question 23-d)*

a) Is it applicable? Yes

b) If so, are sufficient data furnished?_____ If so, attach a draft.

c) Is a field check needed? Yes

12. Exhibit C (question 23-e, f and g)*

a) Is it applicable? Yes

b) Sufficient data?_____ If so, attach a draft.

c) Are rents and charges reasonable?_____

d) Is a field check needed? Yes

13. Exhibit D (question 23-a, b)*

a) Are there sufficient data? No

b) Is the schedule adequate for the work proposed?_____

c) Is the schedule excessive for the work proposed?_____

d) Are the proposed wages and salaries reasonable?_____

e) Is a field check needed? Yes

14. Exhibit E (question 23-c)*

a) Is it applicable? No

b) Sufficient data?

c) Reasonable?

d) Field check needed?

15. In your judgment, can the proposed work be done in the proposed time? Should be checked.

(All exploration must be completed within two years)

16. If field examination is not needed, attach your recommendation.

17. If field examination is needed, do you have any special instructions for the field team not indicated by your answers to the foregoing question? Property can be investigated when field team is in area on other investigations. Although the commodity people have no information concerning this particular area, it is felt that the property does not warrant a special trip.

Enclosure:

1 - MF-103

cc: Field Team Reg. IV (2)
Operating Committee
Docket

Reviewed by: T. L. Chapman

Date 4/14/52

Form MF-103
(April 1951)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
DEFENSE MINERALS ADMINISTRATION

Budget Bureau No. 42-R1035.
Approval expires 6-30-51.

APPLICATION FOR AID FOR AN EXPLORATION PROJECT PURSUANT TO MINERAL ORDER 5, UNDER DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

DO NOT FILL IN THIS BLOCK

Docket No. dma 1886

Date received 7-24-51

Participation

E. L. Ming,
Hackberry, Ariz.

Name and address of applicant

Date June 20, 1951

FILL IN THIS BLOCK

Date of application June 20, 1951

Estimated cost $20,000.00

Mineral or metal Tungsten

Percentage of Government participation 75%

Location of mine About 6 miles southeast of Hackberry, Arizona, in Cottonwood Mining Dist., Mohave County, Arizona

Date of filing MF-100

DMA Docket Number, if available

INSTRUCTIONS

Read Mineral Order 5, Regulations Governing Government Aid in Defense Projects, before completing this application. Submit four signed copies of the application to Defense Minerals Administration, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C., or to the nearest field executive officer thereof, with your name and address on each sheet of the application and all accompanying papers. If any question is inapplicable, or if you cannot answer it, so state on the form. Where the space provided for answer is insufficient, answer on a separate sheet, annex it to the application form, and refer to it in space for answer. If the application is approved, you will be presented with an exploration project contract on Form MF-200, for your signature.

THE APPLICANT

*1. Is applicant an individual, partnership, or corporation? Individual

*2. If a partnership, state names and addresses of partners. —

*3. If a corporation, state names and addresses of officers, directors, and five largest stockholders. —

*4. Describe the mining and general business experience of (*a*) the applicant, and (*b*) the person or persons who will manage the project. Prospecting for 40 years; livestock grower and trucking contractor

*5. Are you the owner or the lessee of the property? Owner

6. If owner, state what claims, liens, or encumbrances, if any, are against the property. No; unpatented claims

7. If lessee, attach a copy of the lease and state if it is in good standing. —

NOTE.—It will be necessary to procure and attach to the exploration project contract agreements of claimants, lienors, encumbrances and lessors subordinating their interests in the property to the interest of the Government under the contract.

8. Furnish current financial statement, showing assets and liabilities, and a profit and loss statement. ~~Attached~~

How much money is applicant prepared to invest in proposed project? Is it sufficient to pay your part of the cost of the project as detailed in question 23 of this application form, in accordance with the regulations on Government participation (Section 9 of Mineral Order 5)? Will expend $5,000. if necessary, and such should be sufficient to pay my part of the project.

*If you have already answered these questions on MF-100, you are not required to answer the questions for this application.

16—64067-1

THE PROPERTY

10. (*a*) Give a description of the real property that will be in any way involved in the exploration project, including any existing mine or operating property. See Exhibit "B" attached

(*b*) Give the legal description of the exact parcel, plot, or area upon which the exploration is to be conducted. See Exhibit "B" attached

NOTE.—If both areas are the same, so state. The only obligation to repay the Government is from the net earnings from any commercial discovery made in the area specified in (*b*) above in which the exploration is to be conducted, and the expenditure of funds which may be charged as costs of the project must be limited to that area or to work necessary to perform the exploration in that area.

*11. State the present and former names of the property, if any. Black Rock Scheelite Mine

*12. State, in detail, the location of the property with reference to towns, railroads, roads, shipping points, including distances and directions and kinds and conditions of roads. 6 mi. SE Mackbery on AZ 93 1/2 mile - truck road extends within about 1/2 mile of property

*13. State source and quantity of water available for operations and its sufficiency at all seasons. State amount of power to be used, rate per hour or other cost, and source. REA power at Mackbery is available

*14. Describe any existing useable facilities, equipment, buildings, or structure now on the property that will be devoted to the exploration work. None on property now

15. State in detail how the ore could be shipped and how and where milled. Either by rail or truck to Bagdad, Ariz.

*16. History:

(*a*) Give a statement, as complete as possible, of previous exploration, development, operation, and production of property, with reasons for any past suspensions of operations. No history - this is new discovery

(*b*) State briefly the known history and production of adjoining and neighboring properties. See Exhibit "C" attached

(*c*) Furnish any available (private) reports that may apply to this application, including results of mine examinations, recommended exploration and development, and metallurgical investigations. No engineer's reports - two assays attached

*17. Production:

(*a*) If mine is in production, furnish the following information: No production as yet

	Tons per day	*Grade or analysis*	*Cost per ton*	*Net value per ton*
(1) Mining				
(2) Milling				
(3) Shipped or sold				

*18. Ore or mineral reserves: (If property is or has been operating.) Not applicable

(*a*) Describe the ore or mineral deposits briefly. Vein is 3/4 mi. long and as wide as 80' containing scheelite

(*b*) Submit available maps and assay data. Assays attached

(*c*) Give estimated tonnage and grade of each class of ore reserves. Not determined

19. State any conditions or circumstances regarding the property not sufficiently brought out by the foregoing questions.

Two engineers have superficially examined this mine and recommend exploration

THE EXPLORATION

20. For what mineral or minerals and for what types of deposits and ores will the exploration be conducted? Tungsten

21. Describe briefly, but concisely, the proposed work and the estimated time required to complete it. Tunnel - 3 mos.

NOTE.—The Government will not participate in a project that will require more than 2 years to complete.

22. Furnish statement of the geological basis of the project with particular emphasis on factors leading the operator to expect the finding of commercial ore bodies. This statement should be accompanied by supporting maps such as geological maps, maps of the proposed openings and assay maps, sample lists, and other pertinent data.

Not available now

THE REQUIREMENTS AND COSTS

23. Tabulate in the form of an itemized statement with a sum for each item the estimated requirements and costs of the project so that the total will give the estimated cost of the project in which the Government will participate, as follows:

(*a*) Labor, by numbers and classes (miners, muckers, millmen, etc.), with wages of each. 2 miners @ $12 per day;

(*b*) Supervisors, by numbers and positions, with salaries of each. 2 muckers @ $10 per day, 1,500.00

(*c*) Cost of necessary repairs to existing facilities, structures, and buildings. ---

(*d*) Cost of necessary installation or construction of additional facilities, structures, and buildings. 2,000.00

(*e*) Cost of items of equipment, not now owned by the applicant which must be purchased for operations at a cost of $50 or more each. 2,500.00

(*f*) Cost of rental for equipment which the operator proposes to rent. 3,000.00

(*g*) Rental value of items of equipment which the operator now owns and which will be devoted to the work. ---

(*h*) Cost of materials and supplies, including items of equipment costing less than $50 each. 3,000.00

(*i*) Cost of power, water, utilities, and any other items not provided for above. 1,500.00

24. Furnish a time schedule of the project, stated in terms of months after project is approved, showing progress expected to be accomplished and the money expected to be spent.

About 50% in first month, during road construction; then 25% per month

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned company, and the official executing this certification on its behalf, hereby certify that the information contained in this form and accompanying papers is correct and complete to the best of their knowledge and belief.

E. L. Ring (Name of company) — By xxx (Signature of authorized official)

June 20, 1951 (Date) — Owner (Title) E. L. Ring

Title 18, U. S. Code (Crimes), Section 1001, makes it a criminal offense to make a willfully false statement or representation to any department or agency of the United States as to any matter within its jurisdiction.

*Same as footnote on page 1.

EXHIBIT "B"

The real property for the exploration of which this loan is sought consists of unpatented lode mining claims. The exact legal description of the ground on which the exploration is to be conducted is as follows:

These certain unpatented lode mining claims, located and situate in the Cottonwood Mining District, Mohave County, Arizona, the names of which and the book and page where the location notices thereof are to be found of record in the Office of the County Recorder of said Mohave County, Arizona, being as follows, to wit:

NAME:	BOOK OF MINES:	PAGE:
BLACK ROCK	4-B	201
BLACK ROCK #1	4-B	202
BLACK ROCK #2	4-B	203
BLACK ROCK #3	4-B	204

Together with the appurtenances.

EXHIBIT "C"

I have no record of the history and production of adjoining and neighboring mines, but my Black Rock Scheelite Mine is located in a well proven mining district and is surrounded by mines having production records of, I believe, considerable consequence. Among these mines are the COPPER GIANT, which is located about 4 miles northwest of my Black Rock Scheelite, and the WALKOVER, about the same distance and location from it. The COPPER GIANT was valuable primarily for copper, according to my information, and the WALKOVER for gold, although I think the Phelps-Dodge Corporation ultimately sold ores the Copper Giant as one of its sources of production for silica, used as flux in their smelter at Clarkdale, Ariz. I believe Schrader's Report of Mineral Deposits in Mohave County, Arizona, made to the Geological Survey, will give much valuable data on this whole district.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OSCAR L. CHAPMAN, SECRETARY

DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION

REPORT OF EXAMINATION BY FIELD TEAM
REGION IV

DMEA-1886, E. L. Ming's Black Rock Tungsten Prospect

Mohave County, Ariz.

C. S. Bromfield, Geologist
U. S. Geological Survey

L. L. Farnham, Mining Engineer
U. S. Bureau of Mines

June 1952

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OSCAR L. CHAPMAN, SECRETARY

DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION

REPORT OF EXAMINATION BY FIELD TEAM
REGION IV

DMEA-1886, E. L. Ming's Black Rock Tungsten Prospect

Mohave County, Ariz.

C. S. Bromfield, Geologist
U. S. Geological Survey

L. L. Farnham, Mining Engineer
U. S. Bureau of Mines

June 1952

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OSCAR L. CHAPMAN, SECRETARY

DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION

REPORT OF EXAMINATION BY FIELD TEAM
REGION IV

DMEA-1886, E. L. Ming's Black Rock Tungsten Prospect

Mohave County, Ariz.

C. S. Bromfield, Geologist
U. S. Geological Survey

L. L. Farnham, Mining Engineer
U. S. Bureau of Mines

June 1952

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OSCAR L. CHAPMAN, SECRETARY

DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION

REPORT OF EXAMINATION BY FIELD TEAM
REGION IV

DMEA-1886, E. L. Ming's Black Rock Tungsten Prospect

Mohave County, Ariz.

C. S. Bromfield, Geologist
U. S. Geological Survey

L. L. Farnham, Mining Engineer
U. S. Bureau of Mines

June 1952

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OSCAR L. CHAPMAN, SECRETARY

DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION

REPORT OF EXAMINATION BY FIELD TEAM
REGION IV

DMEA-1886, C. L. Ming's Black Rock Tungsten Prospect

Mohave County, Ariz.

C. S. Bromfield, Geologist
U. S. Geological Survey

L. L. Farnham, Mining Engineer
U. S. Bureau of Mines

June 1952

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OSCAR L. CHAPMAN, SECRETARY

DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION

REPORT OF EXAMINATION BY FIELD TEAM
REGION IV

DMA-1886, H. L. King's Black Rock Tungsten Prospect

Mohave County, Ariz.

C. S. Bromfield, Geologist
U. S. Geological Survey

L. L. Farnham, Mining Engineer
U. S. Bureau of Mines

June 1952

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OSCAR L. CHAPMAN, SECRETARY

DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION

REPORT OF EXAMINATION BY FIELD TEAM
NO. IV

DMEA-1886, E. L. Kinc's Black Rock Tungsten Prospect

Mohave County, Ariz.

C. S. Brookfield, Geologist
U. S. Geological Survey

L. L. Farnham, Mining Engineer
U. S. Bureau of Mines

June 1952

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OSCAR L. CHAPMAN, SECRETARY

DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION

REPORT OF EXAMINATION BY FIELD TEAM
REGION IV

B-11-1886, L. L. King's Black Rock Tungsten Prospect

Mohave County, Ariz.

C. S. Bromfield, Geologist
U. S. Geological Survey

L. L. Farnham, Mining Engineer
U. S. Bureau of Mines

June 1952

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OSCAR L. CHAPMAN, SECRETARY

BUREAU OF MINES EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION

REPORT OF EXAMINATION BY FIELD TEAM
REGION IV

M-1-1696, C. L. King's Black Rock Tungsten Prospect

Mohave County, Ariz.

G. E. Bromfield, Geologist
U. S. Geological Survey

L. L. Farnham, Mining Engineer
U. S. Bureau of Mines

June 1952

DMA

MAR 2 1952

Mr. E. L. Ming

Hackberry, Arizona

Re: Docket No. DMA 1886 - Tungsten
Cottonwood Mining District
Mohave County, Arizona

Dear Mr. Ming:

A review of your application of June 20, 1951, for a $20,000.00 exploration contract, reveals that letters to you dated August 10, 1951, and January 29, 1952, requested additional information necessary to process your application. We have not received any answer from you and we assume that you no longer desire to proceed with your application.

We wish to cooperate with you in the matter of allowing ample time, but if the needed data have not been received by April 15, 1952, we will then remove the application from the active file and consider the matter closed.

Sincerely yours,

C. O. Mittenderf

Acting Administrator
Defense Minerals Exploration
Administration

GGGentry:le
2/29/52

W.K.K.

cc: Docket
Admn. Reading File
Field Team, Region 4
[illegible] Geehan, USGS
F. M. Lemmon, USGS
G. G. Gentry
O. C. Selfridge

Fwd

DMA

JAN 29 1952

Mr. N. L. Ming
Hackberry, Arizona

Re: Docket No. DMA 1556X - Tungsten
Cottonwood Mining District
Mohave County, Arizona

Dear Mr. Ming:

Our files show that additional information was requested by letter dated August 10, 1951, in regard to the above noted application, and that no answer has yet been received.

Please favor us with the requested information if you wish to continue with your application. In case you do not wish to continue, please so inform us.

Sincerely yours,

G. C. Selfridge, Acting Chief
Iron and Ferro-Alloy Division
Defense Minerals Exploration
Administration

GLBrewer:lm
1/22/52

cc: Admn. Reading File
Docket
R. W. Geehan, USGS
D. M. Lemmon, USGS
Field Team Reg. IV
G. C. Selfridge
G. L. Brewer

Issued
DATE