DMA Form 1

DEFENSE MINERALS ADMINISTRATION
Control Slip

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT

DMA Docket No. 1282 X

DO NOT DETACH THIS SLIP

Action on this document is recorded and controlled in Reports and Records Branch. Any movement of this document between divisions or offices of DMA or movement outside DMA must be reported to the Reports and Records Branch. Actions taken that affect status of the case must also be reported.

This document has been recorded as

Any action taken to change the type of request for assistance must be promptly reported to the Reports and Records Branch. Use DMA Form 2 for submitting these reports.

Routing Slip

To:	Tom Lyon	Date	10-9-51
To:	Reports and Records	Date	OCT 9 1951
To:		Date	
To:		Date	
To:		Date	
To:		Date	
To:		Date	
To:		Date	
To:		Date	
To:		Date	
To:		Date	
To:		Date	
To:		Date	
To:		Date	

DO NOT DETACH

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT

370

Box [illegible]
Hot Springs, South Dakota
October 16, 1951

Tom Lyon, Director
Supply Division
Defense Minerals Administration
Washington, D. C.

Subject: DMA-1282X - Beryl, Mica, etc.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of October 9, 1951, received and I was very much displeased with its contents . Nobody has ever personally contacted me about my property. How can they tell where I have a prospect. My property consists of 207 acres of patented ground laying in one of the most potent mica sections. It is also in the district where Feldspar and Mica have been found quite extensively, and without ever coming near me and letting me know when they examined my land it is not considered feasible.

I know that my mistake was made in not asking for enough money to really explore the ground.

At this time I wish to request you to again send a Field Team that will contact me and make a thorough study of the project and not sit in some pool hall or restaurant and discuss the prospects.

Now it would not be possible to explore this ground with less than $10,000.00 and $20,000.00.

If your organization is really interested in making an honest and conscientious survey of this land let me know and I will be available at any time.

Thanking you, I am,

Edward Rogers.

Edward Rogers
Hot Springs, South Dakota
Box 767

DEFENSE MINERALS
ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D.C.
OCT 19 9 15 AM '51

FILE COPY
SURNAME:

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

370

Wesley Barr

OCT 9 1951

G. E. C.

Memorandum

To: Reports and Records Unit, DMA

From: Chief, Industrial Minerals Branch, DMA

Subject: DMA-1282X, Beryl, mica, etc.
Ed. C. Rogers
Hot Springs, South Dakota
Amount: 90% of $1,000.00

Denial recommended because:

1. Data presented and Field Team examination failed to provide a sound geologic basis to justify the proposal.

Attached:

1. Letter of transmittal from Region V with Field Report.

2. Form DM-103 with additional information.

3. Review of application for exploration assistance with additional information.

James A. Barr, Sr.

Not stripped
R + R

RWASHEY:mp
10-5-51
cc: Field Team, Region V (2)
DMA Docket File
Mr. Barr

Approved:
SIGNED
Director, Supply Division

FILE COPY
SURNAME:

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

370

a.e.c.

Work Barr

OCT 9 1951

Mr. Ed. C. Rogers
Box 767
Hot Springs, South Dakota

Subject: DMA-1282X - Beryl, Mica, etc.

Dear Mr. Rogers:

Your application for aid for an exploration project on Beryl, Mica, etc., deposit located in Custer County, South Dakota, and docketed as DMA-1282X, has been reviewed by this office.

Projects approved by the Defense Minerals Administration must, in its judgment, show definite promise of yielding material of acceptable grade, physical character and specifications, in quantities that will significantly improve the mineral supply position for National Defense.

A very careful study of your proposal, including examination by DMA Field Team, revealed the following:

1. A sound geologic basis for expecting to encounter significant amounts of strategic grade materials in the deposit and hence justify proposed exploration has not been established.

Under these circumstances, your application for exploration aid to the extent of 90% of $1,000 is denied. Should additional information become available, we would be glad to have you resubmit your proposal for consideration.

Unless we receive a request within 30 days, we will consider the case closed.

Sincerely yours,

SIGNED

Don Lyon, Director
Supply Division

8.4.
10.9

RWASKEY:mp
10-5-51
cc: Field Team, Region V (2)
DMA Docket File
Mr. Barr

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

370

October 5, 1951

Memorandum

To: Reports and Records Unit, DMA

From: Chief, Industrial Minerals Branch, DMA

Subject: DMA-1282X, Beryl, mica, etc.
Ed. C. Rogers
Hot Springs, South Dakota
Amount: 90% of $1,000.00

Denial recommended because:

1. Data presented and Field Team examination failed to provide a sound geologic basis to justify the proposal.

Attached:

1. Letter of transmittal from Region V with Field Report.

2. Form MF-103 with additional information.

3. Review of application for exploration assistance with additional information.

James A. Barr, Sr.

Approved:

Acting Director, Supply Division

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
DEFENSE MINERALS ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.
2908 Colfax Avenue South
Minneapolis 8, Minnesota
Region V

DEFENSE MINERALS ADMINISTRATION WASHINGTON, D. C.

OCT 1 8 39 AM '51

September 27, 1951

Memorandum

To: Tom Lyon, Chairman - Coordinating Committee - Defense Minerals Administration - Interior Building - Washington 25, D. C.

From: Executive Officer - DMA Field Team, Region V

Subject: DMA Docket 1282-X - E. C. Rogers
Hot Springs, South Dakota

Enclosed is the subject application, together with four copies of the Field Team's report, denying the proposal to explore for beryl at the Empire Mine in the Black Hills because of geologic reasons and a lack of interest by the applicant.

This docket examination has been held up since last June, because at the time Rogers was ill and the examination could not be made. Since then and until now the examiners had much difficulty contacting Mr. Rogers.

A. B. Needham

Enclosures:

OFFICIAL FILE COPY

To	From	Date
270	A.E.C.	10-1-51
210		

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

DEFENSE MINERALS ADMINISTRATION

REPORT OF EXAMINATION BY FIELD TEAM
REGION V

DMA-1282X

Empire Claim, Custer District

Custer County, South Dakota

Glen Walker, Mining Engineer
U. S. Bureau of Mines

J. A. Redden, Geologist
U. S. Geological Survey

September 25, 1951

DEFENSE MINERALS ADMINISTRATION
Report of Field Examination

by

Glen Walker, Mining Engineer
U. S. Bureau of Mines

J. A. Redden, Geologist
U. S. Geological Survey

Docket No.: DMA-1282X
Property: Empire
Applicant: E. C. Rogers
Commodity: Mica, beryl

Conclusions and Recommendations

It is recommended that this application be denied. The results of the geologic examination indicate that the probability of making a significant discovery of beryl or strategic mica is very remote. Further, on July 5, 1951, a letter requesting additional specific information regarding this proposal was sent to the applicant. To date no reply has been received. Therefore, it is assumed the applicant's interest in the matter is lacking.

Geologic Report

The Empire Claim is located 2½ miles northwest of Custer, South Dakota. The claim was originally located as a gold mine, and several exploration prospects and shallow shafts are located on lenticular quartz veins.

The application is for beryl and mica from a pegmatite located on the claim. Two short open cuts have exposed the pegmatite to a depth of about 7 feet from the hanging wall.

Exposures of the footwall contacts are poor, but apparently the pegmatite is a long, thin, sill-like body. The outcrop length of the pegmatite is over 300 feet long, but most of the length consists of pegmatite less than 10 feet thick. The thicker part of the pegmatite is probably less than 30 feet thick, though the outcrop width is about 80 feet.

The bulk of the pegmatite is composed of homogeneous, unzoned pegmatite. The two prospects are in coarse-grained pegmatite, relatively rich in perthite. This coarse-grained pegmatite is considered to be part of a flat-lying fracture filling. The trend and composition of the fracture filling are very similar to ones exposed in the Hawk pegmatite which is located nearby. The base of the fracture filling is not exposed, but the thickness is very probably less than 12 feet. The length is less than 100 feet.

Reserves and Recommendations

Three crystals of beryl, each less than 4 inches in diameter, were found. A very small portion of the mica appears to be of punch quality.

Zoning is absent in the pegmatite except in the fracture filling. Possible reserves of beryl and mica are very small, and geologic chances of making a significant discovery are very small.

It is recommended that the application be denied on the basis of lack of sufficient favorable geologic evidence.

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 1282X

Date received 5-28-51

Participation

DEFENSE MINERALS ADMINISTRATION WASHINGTON, D.C. 8 AM '51

Mr. Ed. C. Rogers.
Box 167
Hot Springs
So. Dak.

Name and address of applicant

Date May 23, 1951

FILL IN THIS BLOCK

Date of application May 23, 1951

Estimated cost

Mineral or metal

Percentage of Government participation

Location of mine Custer, South Dakota

Date of filing MF-100

DMA Docket Number, if available 1282X

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?
*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.
*5. Are you the owner or the lessee of the property?
6. If owner, state what claims, liens, or encumbrances, if any, are against the property.
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.
9. 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)?

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

    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.

*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.

*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.

*14. Describe any existing useable facilities, equipment, buildings, or structure now on the property that will be devoted to the exploration work.

15. State in detail how the ore could be shipped and how and where milled.

*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.
    (*b*) State briefly the known history and production of adjoining and neighboring properties.
    (*c*) Furnish any available (private) reports that may apply to this application, including results of mine examinations, recommended exploration and development, and metallurgical investigations.

*17. Production:
    (*a*) If mine is in production, furnish the following information:

	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.)
    (*a*) Describe the ore or mineral deposits briefly.
    (*b*) Submit available maps and assay data.
    (*c*) Give estimated tonnage and grade of each class of ore reserves.

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

THE EXPLORATION

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

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

    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.

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.
    (*b*) Supervisors, by numbers and positions, with salaries of each.
    (*c*) Cost of necessary repairs to existing facilities, structures, and buildings.
    (*d*) Cost of necessary installation or construction of additional facilities, structures, and buildings.
    (*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.
    (*f*) Cost of rental for equipment which the operator proposes to rent.
    (*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.
    (*i*) Cost of power, water, utilities, and any other items not provided for above.

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.

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.

(Name of company)	By Edward O Rogers (Signature of authorized official)
May 23, 1951 (Date)	Majority Owner (Title)

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.

16—64067-1 U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Form MF 103

Empire Mine

1. Ground is owned by six people of which Mr. Rogers owns one half. He is active partner.
2. Ray Tarrent unknown
   Angie Tarrent "
   Mrs. Wm Tarrent and two sons "
3. ——
4. The property will be leased to an experienced operator on a share basis.
5. Owner
6. No liens on property.
7. ——
8. Hasn't been worked for many years. Then by Tarrent and Rogers, Sr. Prospects were excellent then. Rogers, the miner, health broke.
9. ——
10. (a) The originonal Empire mine was opened for gold. In 1940 the specimens (40#) assayed $128 per ton by Homestake Gold Mine. The reason for this application is because the man who made the assay said he thought there might be other minerals there needed by the government during war operations.

(*) Near by is Felspar and Berl in paying quantities. This mine is being operated now.

11. Enough time always.

12. The property lies 2 miles from Custer which is on a railway C.B.&Q.R.R. This would necessitate a reworking of a mile of road only. At the present time we are using a road which is 4 miles from town. Transportation would be a very minor problem.

13. There is also a Railway Siding of Burns two miles from the mine on the other side. It is hard surfaced for a mile.

18. Three springs on the property. A dam could be easily built.

14. No equipment on hand.

15. Could be shipped by train or truck. Where milled would depend upon what is found and where it would be milled.

16.(a) The gold mine ceased operations because of the health of the miner Mr. Rogers, Sr. The Mr. Rogers, Jr. only recently became interested in mining but he hasn't the finances to operate. He is offering his mines in case there are other minerals present that are greatly needed. He understands this application must be made by June 1, 1951 and that doesn't give him enough time to find out what except hard work that the ground contains. He has been

advised by other mining men who know the property to make this contact.

(b) The Crown Mine owned by Mrs. Wells has beryl, feldspar, mica. It is 1½ miles from the Empire.

Mr Ballard, once with the U.S. Bureau of Mines has some mining property. This is about a mile from the Empire.

(c)

17. not in production

18. all lost

19.

20. Need help to find out what is available and needed.

21. Two years would be sufficient.

22. None

23.

24.

6/5/51

Defense Minerals Administration

Review of Application for Exploration Assistance

Docket No. DMA-1282X

Commodity Beryl

Total Amount $1,000.00 ?

Govt. Participation 96%

1. Name and Address of Applicant Edward C. Rogers, Box 767
Hot Springs, South Dakota

2. Location of Property 2 miles NW of Custer, South Dakota
Custer County

3. Mineral or metal Beryl 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 See attached sheet

d) Don't know—needs field examination

e) Is there an alternative and favorable project?
(If so, attach an explanation)

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? No - owner

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

*question numbers are those of MF-103

Answer to question 4, DMA-1282X
E. C. Rogers,
Hot Springs,
South Dakota

This is very poor application and the Geological Survey has no file data on the property.

Reference is made to "paying quantities" of beryl and feldspar nearby and this mine is operating now. I interpret this to mean an entirely different mine from the claim of the applicant.

The applicant offers no definite evidence that the property has beryl. He hints that it is mainly a gold mine claim and that they want to see what is there. He states that the assayer said there might be other minerals at the mine that the Government would be interested in during war time.

I think the geologic possibilities for beryl exploration are very poor and that the applicant should be denied due to lack of evidence that the property contains a sufficient amount of beryl to be included in MO-5. There is insufficient time to ask him to give the necessary information that the property has beryl-bearing pegmatites. If necessary the application should be referred to the field along with Roger's other application DMA-1652X - the properties are near each other. JA

J. A. Redden

Is this part a worthwhile exploration project? _____

d) Are the cost estimates detailed? No

Can they be summarized, as on page 2 of Procedural Instruction 5-A, from the available data? No If so, attach a draft.

e) Are the cost estimates reasonable? None given

f) Should more information be requested from applicant? by field team

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

11. Exhibit B (question 23-d)*

a) Is it applicable? Only new structure that would be need is a tool shed

b) If so, are sufficient data furnished? No If so, attach a draft.

c) Is a field check needed? No

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

a) Is it applicable? Yes - no information given

b) Sufficient data? No 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? Not given

c) Is the schedule excessive for the work proposed? No data

d) Are the proposed wages and salaries reasonable? Plans to lease property

e) Is a field check needed? ~~A~~ Yes

7. Are subordination agreements necessary? _____

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 No

b) Equipment and supplies None now - can be secured
(Question 14 plus general knowledge of availability)*

c) Accessibility (question 12)* Yes

d) Water (question 13)* Yes

e) Power (question 13)* gasoline or diesel power needed.

Is a field check needed on any of these points? Yes - all of them.

9. Does the experience of the applicant appear to be adequate to assure that he can properly conduct the proposed project? (question 4)* No - expects to lease to experienced miner

Is a field check needed on this point? Yes

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

a) Is the project adequately described? NO JR No MB

If not, are there sufficient data given so that you can describe the project? No If so, attach a draft.

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

c) Is the proposed work "exploration" under the definition of Section 8, MO-5? Probably JR See attached sheet Question 4

If not, what part of it is? No work described

14. Exhibit E (question 23-c)*

a) Is it applicable? No - no structures on property

b) Sufficient data? —

c) Reasonable? —

d) Field check needed? No

15. In your judgment, can the proposed work be done in the proposed time? No program given

(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? No field examination is necessary as it would require a full examination + planning of an exploration program. No pertinent information re. exploration is in the application

See notes on attached 16V-2-7

Reviewed by: Donald M. Rundt
BLM

Date 6/18/81

97692

6/18/51

Docket No - DMA 1282 X

Empire Mine

So lillle information is contained in the application that no definite opinion can be expressed about the advisability of Government participation. The applicant admits he is not an experienced miner + expects to lease the work to be done. No program is outlined, no costs estimated, + no idea can be gathered as to what it is all about - merely the he wants to reopen an old mine

The old mine apparently was a gold producer but no data are given about the work done or production obtained. The applicant appears to be more concerned with the gold possibilities + use beryl as a justification for the application.

A visit by the field team would not be worth while unless a new application is submitted outlining what is intended + why it might be successful in developing beryl.

The application should be denied with a suggestion that a new application be submitted giving the necessary information about why + how the exploration will be done

MQ

6-26-51

MR. EDWARD C. ROGERS

RE DMA 1652X & 1282X

SEE DMA 1652 856

DMA 1282

856

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

DEFENSE MINERALS ADMINISTRATION

REPORT OF EXAMINATION BY FIELD TEAM
REGION V

DMA-18821

Empire Claim, Custer District

Custer County, South Dakota

Glen Walker, Mining Engineer
U. S. Bureau of Mines

J. A. Redden, Geologist
U. S. Geological Survey

September 25, 1951

DEFENSE MINERALS ADMINISTRATION
Report of Field Examination

by

Glen Walker, Mining Engineer
U. S. Bureau of Mines

J. A. Redden, Geologist
U. S. Geological Survey

Docket No.: DMA-1[illegible]
Property: Empire
Applicant: E. C. Rogers
Commodity: Mica, beryl

Conclusions and Recommendations

It is recommended that this application be denied. The results of the geologic examination indicate that the probability of making a significant discovery of beryl or strategic mica is very remote. Further, on July 5, 1951, a letter requesting additional specific information regarding this proposal was sent to the applicant. To date no reply has been received. Therefore, it is assumed the applicant's interest in the matter is lacking.

Geologic Report

The Empire Claim is located 3½ miles northwest of Custer, South Dakota. The claim was originally located as a gold mine, and several exploration prospects and shallow shafts are located on lenticular quartz veins.

The application is for beryl and mica from a pegmatite located on the claim. Two short open cuts have exposed the pegmatite to a depth of about 7 feet from the hanging wall.

Exposures of the footwall contacts are poor, but apparently the pegmatite is a long, thin, sill-like body. The outcrop length of the pegmatite is over 800 feet long, but most of the length consists of pegmatite less than 10 feet thick. The thicker part of the pegmatite is probably less than 30 feet thick, though the outcrop width is about 80 feet.

The bulk of the pegmatite is composed of homogeneous, unzoned pegmatite. The two prospects are in coarse-grained pegmatite, relatively rich in perthite. This coarse-grained pegmatite is considered to be part of a flat-lying fracture filling. The trend and composition of the fracture filling are very similar to ones exposed in the Hawk pegmatite which is located nearby. The base of the fracture filling is not exposed, but the thickness is very probably less than 12 feet. The length is less than 100 feet.

Reserves and Recommendations

Three crystals of beryl, each less than 4 inches in diameter, were found. A very small portion of the mica appears to be of punch quality.

Zoning is absent in the pegmatite except in the fracture filling. Possible reserves of beryl and mica are very small, and geologic chances of making a significant discovery are very small.

It is recommended that the application be denied on the basis of lack of sufficient favorable geologic evidence.

6/5/51

Defense Minerals Administration

Review of Application for Exploration Assistance

Docket No. DMA-1232X

Commodity Beryl

Total Amount [illegible]

Govt. Participation 90%

1. Name and Address of Applicant Edward C. Rogers, Box 767
Hot Springs, South Dakota

2. Location of Property 2 miles NW of Custer, South Dakota
Custer County

3. Mineral or metal Beryl 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 See attached sheet

d) Don't know—needs field examination

e) Is there an alternative and favorable project?
(If so, attach an explanation)

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? No - owner

Does the lease have sufficient time to run to cover a future

productive period?

*question numbers are those of MF-103

Answer to question 4, DMA-1282X
E. C. Rogers,
Hot Springs,
South Dakota

This is very poor application and the Geological Survey has no file data on the property.

Reference is made to "paying quantities" of beryl and feldspar nearby and this mine is operating now. I interpret this to mean an entirely different mine from the claim of the applicant.

The applicant offers no definite evidence that the property has beryl. He hints that it is mainly a gold mine claim and that they want to see what is there. He states that the assayer said there might be other minerals at the mine that the Government would be interested in during war time.

I think the geologic possibilities for beryl exploration are very poor and that the applicant should be denied due to lack of evidence that the property contains a sufficient amount of beryl to be included in MO-5. There is insufficient time to ask the applicant to give the necessary information that the property has beryl-bearing pegmatites. If necessary, the application should be referred to the field along with Rogers's other application DMA-1652X. The properties are near each other. JR

J. A. Redden

Is this part a worthwhile exploration project?_____

d) Are the cost estimates detailed? No

Can they be summarized, as on page 2 of Procedural Instruction 5-A, from the available data? No If so, attach a draft.

e) Are the cost estimates reasonable? None given

f) Should more information be requested from applicant? by field team

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

11. Exhibit B (question 23-d)*

a) Is it applicable? Only new structure that would be needed is a tool shed

b) If so, are sufficient data furnished? No If so, attach a draft.

c) Is a field check needed? No

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

a) Is it applicable? Yes - no information given

b) Sufficient data? No 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? Not given

c) Is the schedule excessive for the work proposed? No data

d) Are the proposed wages and salaries reasonable? Plans to lease property

e) Is a field check needed? ~~A~~ Yes

7. Are subordination agreements necessary? _____

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 No

b) Equipment and supplies None now - can be secured
(Question 14 plus general knowledge of availability)*

c) Accessibility (question 12)* Yes

d) Water (question 13)* Yes

e) Power (question 13)* gasoline or diesel power needed.

Is a field check needed on any of these points? Yes - all of them.

9. Does the experience of the applicant appear to be adequate to assure that he can properly conduct the proposed project? (question 4)* No - experts to lease to experienced miner

Is a field check needed on this point? Yes

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

a) Is the project adequately described? NO No

If not, are there sufficient data given so that you can describe the project? No 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? Probably be attached check questions

If not, what part of it is? No work described.

14. Exhibit E (question 23-c)*

a) Is it applicable? No - no structures on property

b) Sufficient data? —

c) Reasonable? —

d) Field check needed? No

15. In your judgment, can the proposed work be done in the proposed time? No program given

(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? No field examination is necessary as it would require a full examination + planning of an exploration program. No pertinent information re. exploration is in the application

See notes on attached 165-2-7

Reviewed by: [illegible]
BJM

Date 6/18/57

97692

6/18/51

Docket No - DMA 1282 X

Empire Mine

So little information is contained in the application that no definite opinion can be expressed about the advisability of Government participation. The applicant admits he is not an experienced miner & expects to lease the work to be done. No program is outlined, no costs estimated, & no idea can be gathered as to what it is all about - merely the he wants to reopen an old mine

The old mine apparently was a gold producer but no data are given about the work done or production obtained. The applicant appears to be more concerned with the gold possibilities & use beryl as a justification for the application.

A visit by the field team would not be worth while unless a new application is submitted outlining what is intended & why it might be successful in developing beryl.

The application should be denied with a suggestion that a new application be submitted giving the necessary information about why & how the exploration will be done

MO

FILE COPY
SURNAME:

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

June 4, 1951

Mr. Ed C. Rogers
Box 767
Hot Springs, South Dakota

Subject: DMA-1282X
Re: Exploration Loan
Empire Mine

My dear Mr. Rogers:

Receipt is acknowledged of your application and attachments of May 23, 1951 for an exploration loan under the Defense Production Act of 1950.

The application was assigned Docket Number DMA-1282X and was referred to Mr. James A. Barr, Chief, Industrial Minerals Branch on May 28, 1951.

In any future correspondence relating to your application, kindly refer to DMA-1282X.

Sincerely yours,

LANDON F. STROBEL jho

Landon F. Strobel
Executive Secretary

LFSTROBEL:js
cc: Strobel-2
✓Files
Barr
Lyon