DMA Form 1

DEFENSE MINERALS ADMINISTRATION
Control Slip

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT

DMA Docket No. 1652X

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: Mr Lyon Date 7-31

To: Reports & Records Date 8-8-57

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

INT.-DUP. SEC., WASH., D.C. 98868

Hot Springs, South Dakota
October 13, 1951

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

Subject: DMA-1652X Beryl and Mica

Dear Sir:

Re: Your letter of July 31, 1951.

Would you let me know at what time the survey was made on my project. Nobody ever contacted me. Was this survey made in some pool hall or restaurant or actually on the property?

At this time I request that you send another crew to examine the claim with the idea of spending between Ten and Twenty Thousand Dollars in exploration.

This land lays in some of the best Mica and Beryl section. Why would God Allmighty put mineral all around my ground and pass me up?

If it ~~not~~-possible to reconsider your former ideas and contact me and discuss the proposition and then proper papers might be filled out and a really honest survey made.

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:

Barr

370

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

July 31, 1951

Q.E.C

Mr. Edward C. Rogers
Box 767
Hotsprings, South Dakota

Dear Mr. Rogers:

Subject: DMA-1652X-Beryl and Mica

Your application for aid for an Exploration Project on beryl and mica deposits at the Hawk Lode, near Custer, South Dakota, docketed as DMA-1652X, 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 revealed the following:

1. A sound geologic basis justifying the proposed exploration has not been provided.

2. Examination by DMA Field Team failed to establish sound geologic basis to justify exploratory work.

Under these circumstances, your application for Exploration Aid to the extent of 90% of $2,000 is denied. Should additional information become available, we would be glad to have you resubmit your proposal for consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Tom Lyon BJ 8/9

Tom Lyon, Director
Supply Division

RWASKEY:mp
cc: Reports and Records
Mr. Lyon
Mr. Barr
DMA Files
Field Team, Region V (2)

July 31, 1952

Mr. Edward C. Rogers
Box 767
Hotsprings, South Dakota

Dear Mr. Rogers:

Subject: DMA-1652X-Beryl and Mica

Your application for aid for an Exploration Project on beryl and mica deposits at the Hawk Lode, near Custer, South Dakota, docketed as DMA-1652X, 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 revealed the following:

1. A sound geologic basis justifying the proposed exploration has not been provided.

2. Examination by DMA Field Team failed to establish sound geologic basis to justify exploratory work.

Under these circumstances, your application for Exploration Aid to the extent of 90% of $2,000 is denied. Should additional information become available, we would be glad to have you resubmit your proposal for consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Tom Lyon
Tom Lyon, Director
Supply Division

RMARKEY:mp
cc: Reports and Records
Mr. Lyon
Mr. Barr
DMA Files
Field Team, Region V (2)

370

July 31, 1951

Memorandum

To: Reports and Records Unit, DMA

From: Chief, Industrial Minerals Branch, DMA

Subject: DMA-1652X, Edward C. Rogers
Commodity: Mica-Beryl
Amount of loan: $2,000

Denial recommended because:

1. Sound geologic basis not shown to justify proposed exploration.

2. Field Team examination reported adversely on geology of deposit.

Attached:

1. Report from Field Team, Region V
2. Review of application for exploration assistance with attachment
3. Form MF-103 with attachment

James A. Barr, Sr.

Approved:

Director, Supply Division

RWASKEY:mp
cc: Mr. Lyon
Mr. Barr
DMA Files
Field Team, Region V (2)

July 31, 1951

Mr. Edward G. Rogers
Box 767
Hotsprings, South Dakota

Dear Mr. Rogers:

Subject: DMA-1652X-Beryl and Mica

Your application for aid for an Exploration Project on beryl and mica deposits at the Hawk Lode, near Custer, South Dakota, docketed as DMA-1652X, 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 revealed the following:

1. A sound geologic basis justifying the proposed exploration has not been provided.

2. Examination by DMA Field Team failed to establish sound geologic basis to justify exploratory work.

Under these circumstances, your application for Exploration Aid to the extent of 90% of $2,000 is denied. Should additional information become available, we would be glad to have you resubmit your proposal for consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Tom Lyon, Director
Supply Division

RWASKEY:mp
cc: Reports and Records
Mr. Lyon
Mr. Barr
DMA Files
Field Team, Region V (2)

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

July 18, 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 1652-X - Edward C. Rogers - Hawk Lode

Enclosed is the original application with its supporting data, together with the original and three copies of the Field Team's report on the subject docket.

E. J. Martin
for A. B. Needham

Enclosures:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Defense Minerals Administration
JUL 23 1951
Executive Secretary

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

Region V
2908 Colfax Avenue South
Minneapolis 8, Minnesota

Q.E.C.

July 18, 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 1652-X - Edward C. Rogers - Hawk Lode

Enclosed is the original application with its supporting data, together with the original and three copies of the Field Team's report on the subject docket.

E. J. Martin
for A. B. Needham

Enclosures:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Defense Minerals Administration
JUL 23 1951
TIEBEL
Executive Secretary

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

DEFENSE MINERALS ADMINISTRATION

REPORT OF EXAMINATION BY FIELD TEAM
REGION V

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Defense Minerals Administration
Library
JUL 23 1951
LARSON F. STROBEL
Executive Secretary

DMA-165XX

Hawk Pegmatite, Custer District

Custer County, South Dakota

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

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

July 13, 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-1552X
Property: Hawk
Applicant: Ed. Rogers
Commodity: Beryl, mica

Conclusions and Recommendations

The geological evidence is sufficient to deny the applicant an exploration loan on the Hawk pegmatite. The deposit strikes N. 70° - 75° E. for a distance of about 300 feet and dips 40° - 50° SE. It is 15 to 20 feet thick, but segregated longitudinally into four parts by schist. The plunge is on a small angle and corresponds in direction to the strike of the pegmatite. The deposit is composed mainly of graphic intergrowths of perthite and quartz with minor amounts of muscovite, biotite and tourmaline. The grain size averages less than one foot. Along a fracture filling of quartz five small beryl crystals were found. An open pit 30 feet long, 8 to 12 feet wide, and 15 feet in maximum depth near the western extremity of the deposit discloses the internal composition and structure. The feldspar, mica, and beryl in the dike could no doubt be recovered to a large extent by a milling process, but under present hand methods the deposit has little promise as a profitable producer.

The size, structure and composition of this pegmatite obviate further exploration.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

A.E.C.

June 20, 1951

Mr. Edward [illegible] Rogers
Box 767
Hot Springs, South Dakota

Subject: DMA 1652-X ;DMA 1282-X
Mica, Beryl

Dear Mr. Rogers:

Your application has been referred to Mr. [illegible]B. Meadham, 2936 Colfax Ave. So, Minneapolis8, Minnesota, Executive Officer of the Field Team, Region V, for further information.

Sincerely yours,

Tom Lyon, Director
Supply Director

Rdrmas

cc: Administrator's Reading File
Mr. Strobel
Field Team
Mr. Barr
DMA Files

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

370

July 31, 1951

Q. E. C.

Memorandum

To: Reports and Records Unit, DMA

From: Chief, Industrial Minerals Branch, DMA

Subject: DMA-1652X, Edward C. Rogers
Commodity: Mica-Beryl
Amount of loan: $2,000

Denial recommended because:

1. Sound geologic basis not shown to justify proposed exploration.

2. Field Team examination reported adversely on geology of deposit;

Attached:

1. Report from Field Team, Region V
2. Review of application for exploration assistance with attachment
3. Form MF-103 with attachment

James A. Barr

James A. Barr, Sr.

Approved:

Tom Lyon

Director, Supply Division

FILE COPY
SURNAME:

Barr

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

370

July 31, 1951

Memorandum

To: Reports and Records Unit, DMA

From: Chief, Industrial Minerals Branch, DMA

Subject: DMA-1652X, Edward C. Rogers
Commodity: Mica-Beryl
Amount of loan: $2,000

Denial recommended because:

1. Sound geologic basis not shown to justify proposed exploration.

2. Field Team examination reported adversely on geology of deposit;

Attached:

1. Report from Field Team, Region V
2. Review of application for exploration assistance with attachment
3. Form DF-103 with attachment

James Barr
M.P.
James A. Barr, Jr.

BJ 8/9

Approved:
Tom Lyon

Director, Supply Division

RWASKEY:mp
cc: Mr. Lyon
Mr. Barr
DMA Files
Field Team, Region V (2)

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Defense Minerals Administration
JUL 23 1951
Executive Secretary

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

DEFENSE MINERALS ADMINISTRATION

REPORT OF EXAMINATION BY FIELD TEAM
REGION V

DMA-1652X

Hawk Pegmatite, Custer District

Custer County, South Dakota

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

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

July 13, 1951

RECEIVED
JUL 18 1951
SEC. OF INTER.
APPEAL DIVISION
APPEAL CASES
ROOM 4

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-1652X
Property: Hawk
Applicant: Ed. Rogers
Commodity: Beryl, mica

Conclusions and Recommendations

The geological evidence is sufficient to deny the applicant an exploration loan on the Hawk pegmatite. The deposit strikes N. 70° - 75° E. for a distance of about 300 feet and dips 40° - 50° SE. It is 15 to 20 feet thick, but segregated longitudinally into four parts by schist. The plunge is on a small angle and corresponds in direction to the strike of the pegmatite. The deposit is composed mainly of graphic intergrowths of perthite and quartz with minor amounts of muscovite, biotite and tourmaline. The grain size averages less than one foot. Along a fracture filling of quartz five small beryl crystals were found. An open pit 30 feet long, 8 to 12 feet wide, and 15 feet in maximum depth near the western extremity of the deposit discloses the internal composition and structure. The feldspar, mica, and beryl in the dike could no doubt be recovered to a large extent by a milling process, but under present hand methods the deposit has little promise as a profitable producer.

The size, structure and composition of this pegmatite obviate further exploration.

6/5/51

Defense Minerals Administration

Review of Application for Exploration Assistance

Docket No. DMA 1652-X

Commodity Mica - Beryl

Total Amount $1000.00

Govt. Participation 50%

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

2. Location of Property 1½ miles NW Custer, South Dakota
Custer County.

3. Mineral or metal Mica - 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 Brief examination needed. Most of
b) Poor proposed work would be in development
c) None Category. No evidence on hand or [illegible]
d) Don't know—needs field examination Yes - No information given [illegible]
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

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 No

b) Equipment and supplies No - can be obtained.
(Question 14 plus general knowledge of availability)*

c) Accessibility (question 12)* Yes

d) Water (question 13)* Yes

e) Power (question 13)* Yes.

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 - states work would have to be done by 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-RMB

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? Questionable JR - Not stated RMB -

If not, what part of it is?

Is this part a worthwhile exploration project?_____

d) Are the cost estimates detailed? None given

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? Yes

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

c) Is a field check needed? Yes - only tool shed needed.

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

a) Is it applicable? Yes

b) Sufficient data? No If so, attach a draft.

c) Are rents and charges reasonable? None given

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? probably yes

c) Is the schedule excessive for the work proposed? No program given

d) Are the proposed wages and salaries reasonable? No program given

e) Is a field check needed? Yes

14. Exhibit E (question 23-c)*

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

b) Sufficient data? —

c) Reasonable? —

d) Field check needed? —

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? Handle this & 12-82-X at same time — If a brief Field Exam. indicates that any Exploration is worthwhile then help applicant prepare a program and submit an entirely new application in sufficient detail so that All Necessary Exhibits can be assembled — these two applications do not appear to justify a special trip by Field team to the area — Hold them until something with more apparent merit is being visited in the same general area

Reviewed by: [illegible]
BLM

Date 6/18/51

Page 4 of 4 pages

97692

6/18/51

Docket No. DMA 1652 X

Recommendations Hawk Mine

This application contains very little information & no opinion can be reached as to the work to be done or the possibilities of a successful result of the exploration. A field team investigation is not warranted at present due to lack of information furnished & such a visit would have to start from scratch, study conditions & plan a program of work. The applicant apparently has no ideas as to what should be done.

The applicant should be asked to submit a new application but it would probably be at least three weeks before it would be received & it is doubtful if it would be suitable when received.

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 1652 X

Date received 5-28-51

Participation

Mr. Edward C. Rogers
Box 767
Hot Springs
South Dakota

Name and address of applicant

Date May 23, 1951

FILL IN THIS BLOCK

$1000 - See attached note

Date of application May 23, 1951

Estimated cost ~~$2000.00~~

Mineral or metal Feldspar, beryl, mica

Percentage of Government participation 90%

Location of mine Custer
South Dakota

Date of filing MF-100

DMA Docket Number, if available 1652 X

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.

Mary and Edward C. Rogers
(Name of company)

By Mary C. Rogers
(Signature of authorized official)

May 23, 1951
(Date)

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

Hawk Lode

1. Man and wife partnership
2. Mary C and Edward C. Rogers, Box 767, Hot Springs, South Dakota
3.
4. Mr. Rogers father was an experienced miner but only until recently was Mr. Rogers interested. All work will have to be done by experienced operators on a paying or sharing bases.
5. Owner
6. None
7. —
8. Newly located claim and not much expense thus far. This mine has been worked before by a company.
9. $100.00
10. (a) It is located near 11 other mining claims owned by Mr. Rogers. It is thought by miners that this will be paying property when sufficiently opened up.

(b) No. 71°-30' E - 1500 ft. to So. 71°-30' W, 1500 ft. to N. 18° 30" W. to 600 ft.; ¼ mile west of highway, 1½ miles north of Custer toward Bern R.R. siding. R-4 E - T 5 S. - Sec 27

11. Always been the Hawk.
12. 1½ mi. from Custer on the C. B & Q. R.R.; ¼ mile west of Hiway; 1½ miles from Bern R.R. siding, 1½ mile from a felspar mining mill.
13. No water on claim but ½ mile to other claims water owned by same person. Electric power or gasoline power available.
14. None
15. Milled at local mill at Custer 1½ mile. Trucked to town over ½ mi. dirt and 8 mile of hard surface roads.
16. (a) The original filer advised us to file. He sold his right to a company. They did some little work on it and the prospects look favorable. Like most mines it take more than one think to get it paying. We do not know why the man who operated it quit except he died. It looked good to us so we filed.
(b) The properties right close are owned by Mr. Rogers. He hasn't been financially able to open his mines except a felspar one. which now pays off.
(c) None available.
17. Not known
18. Felspar, mica, beal. (Not known)

19.

20. Felspar, mica, best because of local mills and cheapness of opening cost now.

21. This we are unprepared to state now due to the request for applications to be submitted before June 1, 1951. As soon as we can find an operator to mine on a share basis we'll know.

22. Thus far we are going on experienced men's word.

23. Not known at present

If the government is really interested in helping little miners you will let us know, if

(a) 2 @ $12 daily

(b) 1 @ $15

(c) none

(d) store house, tool shed, loading platform lumber is $80M at nearby mills.

(e) jack hammer, truck, 2 wheelbarrows, picks, etc.

(f)

(g)

(h)

(i) 8 poles available need electric wire for 1 mile.

24. Two months should be needed to start grading in paying quantities.

RECEIVED
JUL 16 1956
Bureau of Reclamation
Engineering Library
Denver

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

DEFENSE MINERALS ADMINISTRATION

REPORT OF EXAMINATION BY FIELD TEAM
REGION V

DMA-165XX

Hawk Pegmatite, Custer District

Custer County, South Dakota

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Defense Minerals Administration
JUL 23 1951
Library Section

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

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

July 13, 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-165EX
Property: Hawk
Applicant: Ed. Rogers
Commodity: Beryl, mica

Conclusions and Recommendations

The geological evidence is sufficient to deny the applicant an exploration loan on the Hawk pegmatite. The deposit strikes N. 70° - 75° E. for a distance of about 500 feet and dips 40° - 50° SE. It is 15 to 20 feet thick, but segregated longitudinally into four parts by schist. The plunge is on a small angle and corresponds in direction to the strike of the pegmatite. The deposit is composed mainly of graphic intergrowths of perthite and quartz with minor amounts of muscovite, biotite and tourmaline. The grain size averages less than one foot. Along a fracture filling of quartz five small beryl crystals were found. An open pit 30 feet long, 8 to 12 feet wide, and 15 feet in maximum depth near the western extremity of the deposit discloses the internal composition and structure. The feldspar, mica, and beryl in the dike could no doubt be recovered to a large extent by a milling process, but under present hand methods the deposit has little promise as a profitable producer.

The size, structure and composition of this pegmatite obviate further exploration.

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

June 26, 1951

Docket mailed →

Surname
Barr
Moon
McKnight for Rowe

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

Subject: DMA 1652-X ; DMA 1282-X
Strategic Mica

Dear Mr. Rogers:

Your application has been referred to Mr. A.B. Needham, 2908 Colfax Ave. So, Minneapolis 8, Minnesota, Executive Officer of the Field Team, Region V, fur further information.

Sincerely yours,

Tom Lyon, Director
Supply Director

RW:mas

cc: Administrator's Reading File
Mr. Strobel
Field Team
Mr. Barr
DMA Files

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

Mailed
JUN 26 1951

Mr. A.B. Needham
2908 Colfax Ave. So.
Minneapolis 8, Minnesota

Dear Sir:

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

Applicant Mr. Edward C. Rogers, Box 767, Hot Springs, So. Dak.

Docket No. DMA-1652-X ;1282-X

Commodity Mica, Beryl

Amount $ 1000.00

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

Very truly yours,

Tom Lyon, Chairman
Coordinating Committee

For Bureau of Mines

For Geological Survey

Mr Barr

6/5/51

Defense Minerals Administration

Review of Application for Exploration Assistance

Docket No. DMA 1652 X

Commodity Mica - Beryl

Total Amount $1,000

Govt. Participation 90%

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

2. Location of Property 1¾ miles NW Custer, South Dakota
Custer County.

3. Mineral or metal Mica - 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 Brief examination needed. Most of
b) Poor proposed work would be in development
c) None category. No evidence on bery or mica - quality, or quantity
d) Don't know—needs field examination Yes - No information
JAR: 6/14/51
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

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 No

b) Equipment and supplies No – can be obtained.
(Question 14 plus general knowledge of availability)*

c) Accessibility (question 12)* Yes

d) Water (question 13)* Yes

e) Power (question 13)* Yes.

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 – states work would have to be done by 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

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? Questionable – Not stated [illegible]

If not, what part of it is?

Is this part a worthwhile exploration project?_____

d) Are the cost estimates detailed? None given

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? Yes

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

c) Is a field check needed? Yes - only foul shed needed.

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

a) Is it applicable? Yes

b) Sufficient data? No If so, attach a draft.

c) Are rents and charges reasonable? None given

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? probably yes

c) Is the schedule excessive for the work proposed? No program given

d) Are the proposed wages and salaries reasonable? No program given

e) Is a field check needed? Yes

14. Exhibit E (question 23-c)*

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

b) Sufficient data? —

c) Reasonable? —

d) Field check needed? —

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? Handle this & 12-82-X at same time - If a brief Field Exam. indicates that Any Exploration is worthwhile then help applicant prepare a program and submit an entirely new application in sufficient detail so that All Necessary Exhibits can be assembled - These two applications do not appear to justify a special trip by Field Team to the area - Hold them until something with more apparent merit is being visited in the same general area -

Reviewed by: [illegible]

B/M.

Date 6/15/57

6/15/57

97692

6/18/51

Docket No. [illegible]A 1652 X

Recommendations Hawk Mine

This application contains very little information & no opinion can be reached as to the work to be done or the possibilities of a successful result of the exploration. A field trip investigation is not warranted at present due to lack of information furnished & such a visit would have to start from scratch, study conditions & plan a program of work. The applicant apparently has no ideas as to what should be done.

The applicant should be asked to submit a new application but it would probably be at least three weeks before it would be received & it is doubtful if it would be suitable when received.