DMEA Form 1

DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION
Control Slip

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT

DMEA Docket No. 4533

DO NOT DETACH THIS SLIP

Action on this document is recorded and controlled in the Docket, Mails and Files Branch. Any movement of this document between divisions or offices in DMEA or movement outside DMEA must be recorded in the Docket, Mails and Files Branch, and therefore, the document must be routed through that Branch.

Copies sent to:

USGS, F

Routing Slip

To:	700	Date	11/5/56
To:	Crawford	Date	11-16-56
To:	Gen Com	Date	11-27-56
To:	H. Johnson	Date	11-28-56
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

224 New Customhouse
Denver 2, Colorado

June 26, 1957

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
DMEA
RECEIVED JUN 28 1957
D.
b/2 C 220
225

Glen Haven Mines
Box 555
Hanksville, Utah

Re: Docket DMEA-4533 (Uranium)
Glen Haven Mines
(Nbko and Glen Haven claims)
Wayne County, Utah

Gentlemen:

Enclosed is a map marked "Please Return" which was attached to the captioned application.

Very truly yours,

Original signed by
W. H. KING

W. H. King
Executive Officer, DMEA
Field Team, Region III

Enclosure
MHM:jy
cc: Sec. Op. Comm. (2)
Harshman
Docket 4533
Chron.

Docket

700 Ching Ellis

November 27, 1956

Summary of Proposed Project

Object: Denial of application for an exploration project.

Docket No.: DMEA-4533

Commodity: Uranium

Applicant: Glen Haven Mines, a partnership composed of John E. Ebdon, Emil Lusko, Donald Lusko and Joseph Lusko.
Box 555
Hanksville, Utah

Property: Glen Haven claims 1 through 56, secs. 4, 5, 8, 9, 16, 17, 20, 21, 28, 29, 30, and 32, T. 27 S., R. 12 E., S.L.M.&B., and Ebko claims 1 through 13, (no sec., township, or range stated), located on the Muddy River, 3 miles southeast of the Vernon Pick discovery (Delta Mine), both groups in Wayne County, Utah

Date of Application: October 27, 1956

Amount of Application: $55,400.00

Work Proposed: On Glen Haven claims - 23 miles of access road, 10,000 feet of plug and core drilling, and unstated amounts of bulldozer stripping and drifting. No specific program.

On Ebko claims - 10 miles of access road and 4,000 feet of drilling. No specific program.

Total Estimated Cost:

Drilling (14,000 ft.)	$35,000.00	
Drifting	10,000.00	
Access roads (33 miles)	9,900.00	
Bulldozer stripping	500.00	
Total		$55,400.00
Government Participation @ 75%		$41,550.00

Field Reports:

Memo by Howard F. Albee, USGS & M.H. Salsbury, USBM, Nov. 7, 1956:

The Applicant presents no documented evidence of mineralized target areas, and no specific program of exploration. An area apparently lying between the Ebko and Glen Haven groups is the subject of a report RME-43, "Reconnaissance of Little Wild Horse Mesa, Green River Desert, Emery County, Utah, 1953," by D. N. Hinckley and J. H. Volgamore. The Salt Wash discussed in the report is probably typical of that which is on the Applicant's claims. Ground reconnaissance revealed only one anomalously

radioactive area. Two anomalous areas located by airborne reconnaissance were also examined. It was concluded that one area warranted no further attention, one area may possibly contain a minor amount of uranium, andone area contains uranium bearing rock of ore grade, but in small and scattered deposits. Further work in the general area was not recommended under present economic conditions.

Exploration on the property does not appear to be justified; however, no specific information is available on the subject claims and for that reason a field examination may be advisable.

Field Team memorandum of November 14, 1956:

Reluctantly agrees with that a field examination may be advisable, mainly on the thesis that a denial without a field examination should be made only on rare occasions. However, since there appears to be ample justification for denial without a field examination, is quite willing to approve such a recommendation.

Commodity Group Comments:

USBM, John E. Crawford, November 20, 1956:

Recommends denial inasmuch as such action is justified by the field team's analysis of the application. The AEC representative dissents, and recommends a field examination.

USGS, W. P. Williams, November 23, 1956:

The Ebko claims seem to be located in an area of Morrison outcrops, so that the Applicant's references and comparisons with the Deltamine, which is in the Chinle formation, are not valid. From the poor production history of the Salt Wash member in the vicinity of the Ebko claims and from the results of reconnaissance in the area by Government geologists, doubts that an exploration project on the property is warranted. The large Glen Haven group is located in an area where the potential ore zones are everywhere deeply buried. As a result, exploration drilling on those claims would certainly be of a wildcat nature. Recommends that the application be denied.

Rare & Miscellaneous Metals Div., Michael Ching, November 27, 1956:

The foregoing comments have brought out the unpromising geological environment associated with the two groups of claims involved. An analysis of the Applicant's capabilities and of the results of work accomplished to date lend further discouragement to the proposed project. Applicant drilled two holes on the Glen Haven claims with a Boyles Bros. drill to depths of 56 and 55 feet respectively. Apparently, in both instances, water was

lost, drill rods stuck, and the overburden was still present at these depths. A Joy core drill was purchased and one hole was drilled down to a depth of 70 feet with no apparent results. Samples were taken from Glen Haven 12-56 claims and sent in for chemical assay but only one assay report was enclosed with the application. It ran only 0.01% U_3O_8. Radiometric testing on Glen Haven 1-11 claims show the best areas running 3 to 6 times background. On the Ebko claims radioactivity was 1 to $1\frac{1}{2}$ times background. Applicant claims to have purchased over $27,000 worth of equipment, yet was unable to have chemical assays run because of poor financial condition. The cart appears to have been placed before the horse.

Conclusions and Recommendations:

Encouraging geological criteria appears to be entirely lacking and the available evidence suggests that denial without a field examination is justified. It is so recommended.

Ernest Wm. Ellis

Ernest Wm. Ellis, Chief
Rare and Miscellaneous
Metals Division

700

FILE COPY

Surname: Ching

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

NOV 28 1956

Glen Haven Mines
Box 555
Hanksville, Utah

Re: Docket No. DMEA-4533 (Uranium)
Ebko and Glen Haven Claims
Wayne County, Utah

Gentlemen:

Your application for aid in an exploration project and other information available to us in Washington concerning the above-named property have been reviewed.

Projects approved by the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration must, in its judgment, show definite promise of yielding materials of acceptable grade in quantities that will significantly improve the mineral supply position for the National Defense Program.

Careful study of all our information indicates to us that the probability of disclosing significant ore reserves is not sufficiently promising to justify Government participation. We regret to advise you that, under these circumstances, your application for exploration assistance is denied.

We wish to thank you for your interest in the Defense Minerals Exploration Program and for bringing your property to our attention.

Sincerely yours,

C. O. Mumford

Administrator

MChing/izm 11-27-56
cc to: Docket
Code 700
Mr. Ching
Admr.'s Reading File
Operating Committee
DMEA Field Team, Reg. III (2)
Messrs. JECrawford, Rm. 3643
THKiilsgaard, Rm. 5224
JOHosted, Rm. 3210, GSA

RCH.

11/26/56

IN REPLY REFER TO:

RECEIVED NOV 26 1956 D.M.E.A.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

November 23, 1956

Memorandum

To: E. W. Ellis, Defense Minerals Exploration Administration

From: W. P. Williams, U. S. Geological Survey

Subject: Review of application, DMEA 4533, Glen Haven Mines, Ebko and Glen Haven claims, Wayne County, Utah (uranium)

The subject application is vague and incomplete; and, as a result, it is difficult to determine and evaluate the applicant's proposals and objectives.

The applicant presumably wishes to explore for uranium ore deposits on 69 mining claims divided into two groups.

The copy of the application reviewed contained no maps of any kind. The applicant says, "Ebko claims are located . . . 3 miles southeast of the Vernon Pick find." Presumably the Delta mine is meant.

No explicit exploration proposals are given. It may be inferred from the sketchy cost estimate that the applicant wishes to do drilling, adit-drifting and road building. No competitive bids for the work from sub-contractors are submitted.

The Ebko claims seem to be located in an area of Morrison outcrops, so that the applicant's references and comparisons with the Delta mine, which is in the Chinle formation, are not valid. From the poor production history of the Salt Wash member in the close vicinity of the Ebko claims and from the results of reconnaissance in the area by Government geologists I doubt that DMEA participation in exploration on the property is warranted. The large Glen Haven group is located in an area where the potential ore zones are everywhere deeply buried. As a result, exploration drilling on those claims would certainly be of a wildcat nature.

I recommend that the application be denied on the grounds that exploration work would not result in a significant discovery.

W. P. Williams

W. P. Williams

11/21/56 gla

RECEIVED NOV 20 1956 D.M.E.A.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF MINES
Washington 25, D. C.

Date November 20, 1956

DMEA Docket No. 4533
DMEA Contract No.
Commodity Uranium
Name of applicant Glen Haven Mines
Name of property Ekko and Glen Haven Claims
Location of property Wayne County, Utah
Estimated cost of project $55,400.

Memorandum ✓

To: Ernest William Ellis, DMEA Member
Uranium Commodity Committee

From: John E. Crawford, Bureau of Mines Member
Uranium Commodity Committee JEC

Subject: Review of Application
(Application, Field Team Report, etc.)

1. Date of subject document: 10/31/56. 2. Date received by reviewer: 11/16/56.

3. Prior reports on this property known to reviewer: Yes ☐ No ☐

4. Prior reports on nearby properties known to reviewer: Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Information available on past production: Yes ☐ No ☐

6. Other pertinent factors known to reviewer: Yes ☐ No ☐

7. Explain items marked yes above:

8. Factors needing special consideration:
   a. Location ☐
   b. Ownership ☐
   c. Evidence of mineralization ☐
   d. Geology ☐
   e. Proposed exploration method ☐
   f. Alternate exploration method ☐
   g. Costs ☐
   h. ☐

9. Action advised:
   a. Obtain information from applicant ☐
   b. Refer to Field Team ☐
   c. Denial [X]
   d. Agree with Field Team ☐
   e. Disagree with Field Team ☐
   f. Suggest alternate plan ☐
   g. Request another examination ☐
   h. Approval ☐
   i. Consult with Mr. _____ at _____ AEC office.

10. Remarks: (Use back of page if necessary) J. O. Hosted, Washington representative of the Atomic Energy Commission, recommends that a field examination be made; we recommend denial inasmuch as such action is justified by the field teams analysis of the subject application.

11-16-56

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

RECEIVED NOV 16 1956 D.M.E.A.

224 New Customhouse
Denver 2, Colorado

November 14, 1956

Memorandum

To: Secretary to the Operating Committee

From: DMEA Field Team, Region III

Subject: Docket DMEA No. 4533 (Uranium) Glen Haven Mines (Ekko and Glen Haven Claims) Wayne County, Utah

Enclosed are the original and three copies of a joint memorandum of review of the subject application by members of the Grand Junction Office, DMEA.

They recommend a field examination to verify conclusions based on a reconnaissance of the area, since no specific information is available.

The Field Team rather reluctantly agrees with the recommendations made in this case, mainly on the thesis that a denial of an application without a field examination should be made only on rare occasions. However, there appears here to be ample justification, according to the reviewers' analysis for denial without a field examination, and the Field Team would be more willing to approve such a recommendation.

DMEA Field Team, Region III

W. M. Traver

By W. M. Traver
Executive Officer

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
P. O. Box 360
Grand Junction, Colorado

MINERAL DEPOSITS
IN REPLY REFER TO:
DMEA
RECEIVED
NOV 12 1956
U. S.
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
DENVER, COLORADO

DMEA
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NOV 13 1956
REGION III
DENVER, COLORADO

November 7, 1956

Memorandum

To: Executive Officer, DMEA Field Team, Region III

Through: J. William Hasler
E. N. Harshman

From: Howard F. Albee
M. H. Salsbury

Subject: Application for DMEA aid (Uranium), Glen Haven Mines, Ekko and Glen Haven claims, Wayne County, Utah.

RECEIVED
NOV 16 1956
D.M.E.A.

The subject application is sketchy, the applicant gives no documented evidence of mineralized target areas, and no program of exploration is included.

The applicant area has been discussed with A.E.C. personnel, although none had been on the claims nor in the area in the last two or three years. RME-43, "Reconnaissance of Little Wild Horse Mesa, Green River Desert, Emery County, Utah, 1953" by D. N. Hinckley and J. H. Volgamore, discusses an area that apparently lies between the Ekko group and the Glen Haven group. The Salt Wash discussed in the paper is probably typical of that which is on the applicant claims.

Little Wild Horse Mesa was covered by ground reconnaissance which revealed only one anomalously radioactive area. Two anomalous localities discovered by airborne reconnaissance were also examined. The conclusions of the work were that one locality warranted no further attention, one locality may possibly contain a minor amount of uranium, and one locality contains uranium bearing rock of ore grade but in small and scattered deposits. Further work in the area was not recommended under present economic conditions.

The applicant states that "the potential ore lies in the Salt Wash or the Shinarump which should be only 300 to 400 feet from the surface, . . ." The applicant is undoubtedly referring to the Moss Back member of the Chinle formation which is at least 2,000 feet below the Salt Wash.

Glen Haven Mines 11/7/56

Exploration on the property does not appear to be justified; however, as no specific information is available, a field examination may be advisable to verify conclusions based on previous general reconnaissance of the area. ?

Howard F. Albee

Howard F. Albee,
Geological Survey

M. H. Salsbury

M. H. Salsbury,
Bureau of Mines

HFA/mlr

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Defense Minerals Exploration Administration
Washington 25, D. C.

November 5, 1956

Glen Haven Mines
P. O. Box 555
Hanksville, Utah

Subject: DMEA-4533
Re: Exploration Assistance

Gentlemen

Your application for exploration assistance, dated October 27, 1956 submitted to our office at Denver, has been assigned Docket Number DMEA-4533 and referred to the Rare and Miscellaneous Metals Division in the Washington office. Kindly identify all future correspondence relating to your application by this Docket Number.

Sincerely yours,

Allen S. Dakan, Chief
Operations Control and
Statistics Division

Copy to:

Region III. Denver 2, Colorado

Code 700

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

RECEIVED NOV 5 1956 D.M.E.A.

224 New Customhouse
Denver 2, Colorado

November 1, 1956

Memorandum

To: Secretary to the Operating Committee

From: Executive Officer, DMEA Field Team, Region III

Subject: Application for DMEA aid (Uranium), Glen Haven Mines, (Ebko and Glen Haven claims), Wayne County, Utah

Enclosed are two copies of the subject application in an unknown amount. The application is very sketchy and the applicant has no proof of a definite mineralized target area or any definite exploration program outlined. It would be unknown that uranium was the subject of the application if it were not for the letter from Emil Lusko, dated October 27, 1956, which is attached to the application. It appears to be a clear case of prospecting.

One copy of the application, containing the only location map submitted by the applicant, is being forwarded to the Grand Junction office, DMEA for their recommendation concerning the value of a field examination and one copy is being retained in our file.

W. M. Traver

W. M. Traver

Enclosures

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

RECEIVED
NOV 5 1956
D.M.E.A.

224 New Customhouse
Denver 2, Colorado

November 1, 1956

Glen Haven Mines
P. O. Box 555
Hanksville, Utah

Re: Application for DMEA aid (Uranium), (Ekko and Glen Haven claims) Wayne County, Utah

Gentlemen:

This will acknowledge receipt of your application for DMEA aid on the captioned property. Your application is being forwarded the Washington office, DMEA, for further processing. They will advise you regarding their requirements for additional information.

Returned herewith are the Amended Location Certificates and Notices of Location which you forwarded with your application and asked that they be returned. Since you have given us the book and page of recording on these claims, we will have no further need for this material.

Very truly yours,

Original signed by
W. M. TRAVER

W. M. Traver
Executive Officer, DMEA
Field Team, Region III

Enclosures

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

RECEIVED NOV 5 1956 DMEA

224 New Customhouse
Denver 2, Colorado

November 1, 1956

Memorandum

To: J. W. Haaler

From: DMEA Field Team, Region III

Subject: Application for DMEA aid (Uranium) Glen Haven Mines, (Ebko and Glen Haven claims), Wayne County, Utah

Enclosed is the subject application in an unknown amount.

Please discuss this application with the Bureau of Mines representative in the Grand Junction office and the AEC and forward this office nine copies of your joint recommendations concerning the advisability of making a field examination.

DMEA Field Team, Region III

Original signed by
W. M. TRAVER

By W. M. Traver
Executive Officer

Enclosures

HMC/pw

cc: Sec.Op.Comm. (2)
Harshman
Shaw (2)
Docket
Chron

MF-103
(Revised April 1952)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION

Form Approved.
Budget Bureau No. 42-R1035.2.

DMEA

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OCT 31 1956
REGION III
DENVER, COLORADO

APPLICATION FOR AID IN AN EXPLORATION PROJECT PURSUANT TO DMEA ORDER 1 UNDER THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

Not to be filled in by applicant

Docket No. 4533
Metal or Mineral Uranium
Date Received 11-5-56
Estimated Cost $55,400
Participation (Government %)

INSTRUCTIONS

1. *Name of applicant.*—(*a*) State here your full legal name, in the form in which you will wish to contract, and your mailing address: GLEN HAVEN MINES - ORGANIZED STATE OF UTAH - BOX 555 HANKSVILLE, UTAH

PARTNERS: JOHN E. EBDON, EMIL LUSKO, DONALD LUSKO, JOSEPH LUSKO

(*b*) If other than an individual, add to your name above whether a corporation, partnership, etc., and the name of the State in which incorporated or otherwise organized.

(*c*) If a corporation, add to above statement, titles, names and addresses of officers.

(*d*) If a partnership, add to the above statement the names and addresses of all partners.

2. *General.*—Read DMEA Order 1, "Government Aid in Defense Exploration Projects," before completing this application. Submit this application and all accompanying papers in quadruplicate (four copies), with your name and address on each sheet of the application and on all accompanying papers. Where sufficient space is not provided on the form for all required information, state it on an accompanying paper, with a reference in each case to the instruction to which it refers by number. Comply with all applicable instructions; or, if not applicable, so state. File the application with Defense Minerals Exploration Administration, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C., or with the nearest field executive officer thereof.

3. *Applicant's property rights.*—(*a*) State the legal description of the land upon which you wish to explore, including all land which you possess or control that may be benefited by the exploration, and excluding any land or interest in land which is not to be included in the exploration project contract GLEN HAVEN CLAIMS 1 thru 56 - GREEN RIVER DESERT - FEDERAL LAND - WAYNE COUNTY, UTAH

EBKO CLAIMS - MUDDY RIVER MORRISON REEF - FEDERAL LAND, WAYNE COUNTY, UTAH

(*b*) State any mine name by which the property is known.

(*c*) State your interest in the land, whether owner, lessee, purchaser under contract, or otherwise LODE CLAIM LOCATERS

(*d*) If you are not the owner, submit with this application a copy of the lease, contract, or other document under which you control the property.

(*e*) If you own the land, describe any liens or encumbrances on it

(*f*) If the land consists of unpatented claims, add to the description above, the book and page numbers for each recorded location notice. see attachment

4. *Physical description.*—(*a*) Describe in detail any mining or exploration operations which have been or now are being conducted upon the land, including existing mine workings and production facilities. State your interest, if any, in such operations. Also describe accessibility of mine workings for examination purposes. see attachment

(*b*) State past and current production, and ore reserves, if any, giving quantities and grades.

(*c*) Describe the geologic features of the property, including mineralization, type of deposit (vein, bedded, etc.), and your reasons for wishing to explore. Illustrate with maps or sketches. Send with your application (but not necessarily as a part of it) any geologic or engineering report, assay maps, or other technologic information you may have, indicating on each whether you require its return to you.

(*d*) State the facts with respect to the accessibility of the project: Access roads, distances to shipping, supply and residence points.

(*e*) State the availability of manpower, materials, supplies, equipment, water, and power.

5. *The exploration project.*—(*a*) State the mineral or minerals for which you wish to explore ANY OF THE MINERALS IN QUANTITY ON THE ASSAY RETURN (ENCLOSED)

(*b*) Describe fully the proposed work, including a map or sketch of the property showing a plan (and cross sections if needed) of any present mine workings, and the location of the proposed exploration work as related to such features as contacts, veins, ore-bearing beds, etc. see attachment

(*c*) The work ~~will start within~~ has started ..... days and be completed within 12 months from the date of an exploration project contract.

(*d*) State the operating experience and background of the applicant with relation to the ability to carry out such exploration project, and also that of the person or persons who will supervise the operations. see attachment

6. *Estimate of costs.*—Furnish a detailed estimate of the costs of the proposed work (you will have to use a separate sheet), under the following headings. Add the totals under all headings to give the estimated total cost of the project: see attach.

(*a*) *Independent contracts.*—(Note.—If the applicant does not intend to let any of the work to contractors, write none after this item. To the extent that the work is to be contracted, do not repeat the cost of the contract-work in subsequent items.) State the cost of any proposed independent contracts for the performance of all or any part of the work, expressed in terms of units of work (such as per foot of drilling, per foot of drifting, per hour of bulldozer operations, per cubic yard of material moved, etc.).

(*b*) *Labor, supervision, consultants.*—Include an itemized schedule of numbers, classes and rates of wages, salaries or fees for necessary labor, supervision and engineering and geological consultants.

(*c*) *Operating materials and supplies.*—Furnish an itemized list, including items of equipment costing less than $50 each, and power, water and fuel.

(*d*) *Operating equipment.*—Furnish an itemized list of any operating equipment to be rented, purchased, or which is owned and will be furnished by the Operator, with the estimated rental, purchase price, or suggested use-allowance based on present value, as the case may be.

(*e*) *Rehabilitation and repairs.*—Furnish a detailed list showing the cost of any necessary initial rehabilitation or repairs of existing buildings, installations, fixtures, and movable operating equipment, now owned by the Operator and which will be devoted to the exploration project.

(*f*) *New buildings, improvements, installations.*—Furnish a detailed list showing the cost of any necessary buildings, fixed improvements, or installations to be purchased, installed or constructed for the benefit of the exploration project.

(*g*) *Miscellaneous.*—Furnish a detailed list showing the cost of repairs to and maintenance of operating equipment (not including initial rehabilitation or repairs of the Operator's equipment), analytical work, accounting, workmen's compensation and employers' liability insurance, and payroll taxes.

(*h*) *Contingencies.*—Give an estimate of any necessary allowances for contingencies not included in the costs stated above.

NOTE.—No items of general overhead, corporate management, interest, taxes (other than payroll and sales taxes), or any other indirect costs, or work performed or costs incurred before the date of the contract, should be included in the estimate of costs.

7. (*a*) Are you prepared to furnish your share of the cost of the proposed project in accordance with the regulations on Government participation (Sec. 7, DMEA No. 1)? YES

(*b*) How do you propose to furnish your share of the costs?

☐ Money ☒ Use of equipment owned by you ☐ Other

Explain in detail on acompanying paper.

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned, whether as an individual, corporate officer, partner, or otherwise, both in his own behalf and acting for the applicant, certifies that the information set forth in this form and accompanying papers is correct and complete, to the best of his knowledge and belief.

Dated October 27, 1956

Emil Lusko
(Applicant)

By

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.

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 16—66551-1

RECEIVED NOV 5 1956 D.M.E.A.

3. f. Glen Haven Claims 1 thru 56:

Claim	Book:	Page
1	0-14	57
2-11	0-17	129-139
12-29	0-19	529-546
30-56	0-20	491-517
Mbko Claims 1-13: 1-13	0-20	539-551

Sent 11/28/56

4. a. Glen Haven Claims 12 thru 56 drilled with a Boyles Bros. X-Ray Model Drill, one hole 56 feet. Drill not big enough, ceased operations, overburden still present at this depth. Accessibility: good.

Glen Haven Claims 1-11 drilled one hole 55 feet, lost water, rod froze with same drill rig. Conclusion: rig too small. Drilling between June 1st and July 12th, 1956.

Purchased a 1954 International Truck mounted with a Joy Model 22BD Core Drill, a 1951 Ford mounted with a 1000 gallon vacuum fill water tank and a 1947 Ford truck mounted with a 427 cu. ft. Gardner Denver air compressor. With this rig, we, to this hour, have drilled our first hole 50 ft., lost circulation, ceased the depth, and are down 70 ft. No exploration on Mbko claims to this date.

b. None

c. To our knowledge, the formation is entrada with a salt wash cap on Glen Haven 1-11. On Glen Haven 12-56, the same formation exists but with much loose gravel where the mineralization runs for approximately 4000 ft. From these 45 claims, samples were sent in for chemical assay and returned with the enclosed reports. The type of deposit appears to be bedded. The area is spewed with a volcanic ash material in lumps from 1 to 100 pounds and from the minerals present, it would indicate that they are definitely magma in origin. In this group, no noticeable radiometric change can be seen with a counter or scintillator. In the group from 1-11, eight areas that have been checked over a period of 2 years show an increase of from 3 to 6 times the background. This is the area that from drilling and losing our water would indicate a very broken or fractured formation. The two groups of claims are located near a theoretical quartz fault and on an anticline that extends from Temple Mountain down through our claims. Solutions were present due to the altering and bluegreen coloring and yellow sandstone.

Mbko Claims are located on the Muddy River in the Morrison Reef just 3 miles southeast of the Vernon Pick find. Here no exploration other than minor blasting in the conglomerate beds of the Morrison salt wash. The strata has been tipped up due to the swell, thereby exposing the CARMEL, ENTRADA, CURTIS, SUMMERVILLE, SALTWASH, MORRISON AND THE brushy basin member. Here we feel the potential ore lies in the salt wash or in the shinarump which should be only 300 to 400 ft. from the surface, again due to the tip up. Radiometric is 1 to 1½ background. No past ore shipments here. Deposits appear to be in vein type.

Road building is necessary. No chemical assays due to financial condition.

d. All of Glen Haven claims are located on a straight line which would constitute building a road only 3 miles from Utah Hwy. 24. Nearest mill at Thompson, Utah a distance of 75 miles. Supply point at Green River, Utah 45 miles. Residence civil aeronautic airport 8 miles on a straight line, and Hanksville 12 miles distance.

Ebko Claims - 1½ miles of road building to connect a bulldozed road then approximately 95 miles on the road that carries ore from Vernon Picks mine to Thompson, Utah. Supply point, Green River, Utah. Residence, Temple Mountain Junction 40 miles.

e. 6 men, drill mounted truck, compressor mounted truck, water tank truck, water from the Fremont and Muddy Rivers, also from Hanksville city power consists of a 5000 watt generator.

5. b. Glen Haven Claims will necessitate building 3 miles of road to remove the ore from the drill area and approximately 20 miles of access road cutting to the different drill sites; approximately 10,000 ft of plug and core drilling, will be needed. Drifts should be used to determine the extent and depth of the mineralized zone, or stripping with a bulldozer. Ebko claims 4000 ft. of drilling, 10 miles or road cutting.

d. 60,000 miles in a jeep, caught in quicksand, almost fell off a cliff, kidney infection, drilled with a Boyles Bros. drill, stuck rod, and the ambition and drive to continue. John Campbell, driller, with 17 years experience to work with us.

6. Glen Haven and Ebko claims combined costs:

Drilling:	$55,000
Drifting:	10,000
Rd. Ctg.:	9,900
Rim Strip:	500
TOTAL	$75,400

a. Bulldozing: $10,400

b. Drill Operator: $400 per mo. for 12 mo. $4,800
.03 per ft. 1,050
Room and board @ $4 day 1,440
TOTAL $7,290

c. Gasoline: 50 gallons per day @ .30 gal. 12 mo. period: $5,400
Water: $2 per 1000 gallon 12 mo period 730
TOTAL $6,130

d. Joy 22HD Diamond Core Drill on International truck: $16,000
500 ft. drill rod @ $19.50 per length (10 ft) 975
40 ft. casing @ $20 per 10 ft. length 80
ACCESSORIES:
23 Cavel rock bits @ $47.50 ea. 1,092
2 diamond core bits @ $275 ea. 550
4 finger bits @ 12.50 ea. 50
TOTAL $18,747

d. cont'd
1951 Ford Truck with 1000 gal. water tank , vacuum fill, Coleman 4 wheel front drive

Truck	$ 703
Pt. Dr.	2200
Vac.	1100
TOTAL	$4,003

1947 Ford Truck with 429 cu. ft. Gardner Denver Air Compressor

Truck:	$ 575
Compr.:	3700
TOTAL	$4275

Grand Total of Trucks: $27,025

e. Mechanical and tire failure unpredictable.

f. A six building housing outfit at $5,000 from the Utaco Uranium Co. of Moab, Utah.

g. Repairs and upkeep of equipment cannot be determined accurately. Accounting, workmen's compensation and insurance we are unfamiliar with and payroll taxes we have none, therefore, that too is unknown.

h.

Rod breakage	$ 97.50
Rod loss	195.00
Bit loss	500.00
TOTAL	$792.50

Box 556
Hanksville, Utah
October 27, 1956

RECEIVED
NOV 5 1956
U.M.E.A.

Bureau of Mines
224 New Customhouse
Denver 2, Colorado

Dear Sir:

In conclusion to all that has been written, I would in my own manner of writing, like to explain why we are in need of assistance.

For a period of 2 years, we have combined our knowledge, energies, and finances so as to make a go in the Uranium fields. Finally, after this time, we controll some 1500 acres of what we think is potential Uranium ground. We left our comfortable paying jobs, sold our homes and possessions, cut all ties and have been declared insane by the remainder of our relatives and plunged all the way in.

To date, we own as already stated in the application, a 3 piece drilling rig, 4 house trailers, a half dozen radio-active detecting instruments, numerous small items needed for carrying out a drill program, 1 jeep, and a ranch wagon.

In securing all this, we are quite financially embarrased and find ourselves unable to operate effectively. The samples sent in for assay were pieces of the mineralized sandstone that has been exposed to sun, wind, rain, and any condition that prevails out here.

We realize the .01% Uranium reading is not much, but we feel that the source is somewhere near. The iron content is tremendous and the zone is highly mineralized. The acid and base materials are present and a host rock is at hand. Aside from all this, in another section of those claims, there is a number of truly hot spots that actuate a counter something above the background. Small pieces of sandstone are near commercial grade ore but they seem to be float material. Again, we feel the source is near.

We can furnish the manpower and the most of necessary equipment, some money also. If we could purchase a bulldozer that too we could operate and eliminate the expense of contracting, but this financial assistance we are in dire need of. If we could do it without we would, but we are up against it.

Consideration of a loan to cover the cost of this exploration program would be deeply appreciated at this time. Our Glen Haven claims are surveyed and recorded: T-27S R.13E; sections 4,5,8,9,16,17, 20,21,28,29, 30,33.

Sincerely,

Emil Lusko

Emil Lusko
Glen Haven Mines

Telephone 705

P. O. Box 497

Four Corners Laboratory, Inc.

Assayers and Chemists

CORTEZ, COLORADO

RECEIVED NOV 5 1955 D.M.E.A.

RECEIVED: 11/9/55

SUBMITTED BY: Emil Lusko
Box 1-S
Hanksville, Utah

DATE November 11, 1955

LABORATORY SAMPLE NUMBER	Sample Marking	Uranium % as U_3O_8		Vanadium	Lime	Copp
		Chemical	Radiometric*	% as V_2O_5	% as $CaCO_3$	% as
1239	No Marking	.01%				

* The radiation detected is expressed as equivalent to Uranium as % U_3O_8

Cortez Sentinel Form No. 49

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

FOUR CORNERS LABORATORY, INC.

BY

Peter T. Schuyler

is