MAY 28 1952

Mr. R. C. Miller
Executive Officer, Region III
1012 Flood Building
870 Market Street
San Francisco 2, California

Re: Docket No. DMA 45 - Tungsten
The Mono Ore and Mono Extension
Groups of Claims
Mono County, California

Dear Mr. Miller:

Enclosed herewith are two copies of a letter dated May 5, 1952, by Mr. Harry Epstein. Will you please furnish us with comments by both you and the field team on the letter.

We believe that it is advisable that the property be re-examined. We suggest that the re-examination be made by a different field team and that sufficient samples be taken of the mineralized showings upon which definite conclusions can be drawn with regard to the economic possibilities of the property. If the assays of the samples suggest that some exploration work be done, we believe it best that any discussion with Mr. Epstein be held in abeyance until we have had time to study the field report and the conclusions and recommendations contained therein.

Sincerely yours,

(signed) FRANK E. JOHNSON

Chairman, Operating Committee
Defense Minerals Exploration
Administration

Enclosures

GCSelfridge:lm
5/26/52

Approved:

W. E. Hedges
Member, Bureau of Mines

/s/ D. M. Lemmon
Member, Geological Survey

cc: Admn. Reading File
Docket
R. W. Cochran, USBM
D. M. Lemmon, USGS
Field Team Reg. III
Operating Committee
G. C. Selfridge

Mr. Harry Epstein, President
Tungsten Associates, Ltd.
275 So. Beverly Drive, #5
Beverly Hills, California

Re: Docket No. DMA 45 - Tungsten
The Mesa Ore and Mesa Extension
Groups of Claims
Mono County, California

Dear Mr. Epstein:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 5, 1952, with which you forward 4 copies each of the application forms MF-103 and MF-100.

After due consideration of the additional information which you included in your letter, we are requesting that Mr. Miller make a more complete and detailed re-examination of your property. This will probably be done by another field team which will take such samples as are warranted.

We shall appreciate any assistance that you can give the members of the field team during the examination. We specifically desire that the field team seen all of the best mineralization exposed on the property.

Sincerely yours,

C. O. Mittendorf

Acting Administrator
Defense Minerals Exploration
Administration

GCSelfridge'lm
5/26/52

cc: Adm. Reading File
Docket
Asst. Secretary Rose
R. W. Geehan, USBM
D. M. Lemmon, USGS
Field Team Reg. III
G. C. Selfridge

MF-500

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
DEFENSE MINERALS ADMINISTRATION

REFERENCE SLIP

DATE 7/18/52

REFERRED TO:

1. Mr. Seltzer
2. Rm. 3538
3.
4.

FOR:

..... Action	..... Recommendation
..... Approval	..... Record of .....
..... Comment	..... Referring to .....
..... Conference	..... Reply for signature of .....
..... Consideration	..... Rewriting
..... Filing	..... Signature
..... Instructions	..... Suggestions
..... Investigation	..... Your information
..... Initials	
..... Mailing	
..... Previous correspondence	

REMARKS: Returned with letter to Bureau of Reclamation

Check (X) before the items needing attention.

R. Nelson
Initials of sender.

GPO 16—63815-1

Re: DMEA

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

DMEA

400

APR 24 1952

Dear Mr. Barbaster:

This is in reply to your letter dated April 7, 1952, in which you protest the actions taken by DMEA with respect to the application of your client firm, the Tungsten Associates, Ltd. You specifically criticize a memorandum prepared by Mr. Mittendorf on the basis of its contained misstatements of fact, and you accuse the Administration generally of discriminating against small tungsten producers by not according to them equal consideration with that extended to larger corporations. Since it is my sincere and primary objective to see that the exploration program, which is administered by the Department of Interior, is conducted fairly and with a minimum of criticism, I am always glad to consider the complaints of applicants who are dissatisfied, and in this respect I appreciate very much the opportunity to personally reply to your letter.

The various points of criticism which you make with regard to the memorandum furnished to Senator Morse have been given careful consideration. The statements recorded by Mr. Mittendorf are found to represent an accurate chronological summary of the docket of the Tungsten Associates, Ltd., and the memorandum contains no misrepresentations, as you allege, made inadvertently or otherwise. The file in the subject case is available for your inspection as an authorized counsel for the applicant, or for inspection by any other duly authorized officer of Tungsten Associates, Ltd.

The differences of opinion between the applicant and the Government engineers may be briefly and simply stated. The applicant, on one hand, claims the existence of sizable arrastres of a commercial grade, while on the other hand, Government engineers have been unable to confirm the applicant's contention. A very conscientious attempt has been made on the part of Government representatives to confirm the statements of the applicant, and his property has been carefully sampled on two different occasions by competent mining engineers, with identical adverse results. It was hoped that the ore grade question might be resolved for all time, perhaps in favor of the applicant, by obtaining more representative samples on a mill run scale. However, reports of the results of the ore mill tests made only confirm the negative results previously obtained by our field engineers.

I wish to assure you that there was no alternative left to us but to deny the application, since we could not prudently justify the expenditure of Government funds based on the facts in hand. I also

wish to assure you that the denial of this application, as in the case of all other denials, will in no way prejudice our reconsideration based on new information.

The applicant requested reconsideration of the case on January 9, 1952, and on January 17 we acknowledged his letter, outlined our position in the matter, and requested certain additional information. Our files do not indicate that the applicant has replied to our letter of January 17.

I welcome the opportunity to comment on your charge that we are not conducting the administration of this program to the best interests of the small operator. Such an impression is entirely erroneous and is contrary to the facts as disclosed by the record. At this writing a total of 33 separate exploration contracts for tungsten have been approved. There are no large corporations appearing in this list of 33 projects, such as the United States Vanadium Corporation, the General Electric Company, and the Molybdenum Corporation of America, as you have alleged. The location of these projects is divided quite evenly between seven western States and Alaska, and the average approved cost of the projects in force is $44,904. Our Divisional records show, as of April 1, that an additional 57 tungsten exploration projects are under active consideration and in various stages of completion, and that the applicants are almost entirely small operators whose projects will cost on the average of $40,000 to $50,000. I am happy also to report that a high priority of action is being given to these 57 pending applications, that our progress is abreast of the incoming workload, and that we do not have a backlog of cases which are filed and awaiting consideration. The situation that I have cited with respect to tungsten also applies generally to the overall activities of the DMEA covering the 34 metals and minerals eligible for exploration assistance. Our records show that almost 65 percent of the contracts approved thus far have been for small, independent partnerships and corporations, many of which are members listed as previously established mining concerns of long record.

I again wish to state my appreciation of the opportunity of addressing you in these matters and to assure you of my continuing desire to cooperate toward the solution of your client's problems, consistent with our established rules and regulations.

Sincerely yours,

(Sgd) Robert B. Rose, Jr.
Assistant Secretary

Mr. George W. Rochester
639 South Spring Street
Los Angeles 14, California

Copies to Senator Kerr
Senator Knowland

CCMittendorf/fw
4/22/52
cc: Secy's Reading File
Secy Rose
Undersec'y Searles
Admr's Reading File, DMEA
Mails & Files, DMEA
Mr. Salfridge, DMEA

Copies to Leg. III
8/29/52

The RFC applications were transmitted to Dr. Boyd by the Washington Office, Inc., on January 15, 1951. The Field Team did not recommend the $750,000 loan requested of RFC but in its report the Field Team submitted for consideration by Washington a program amounting to $168,000.

(4) The denial pertained to the program submitted by the Field Team for consideration by Washington and indirectly to the RFC application.

(5) Tungsten as WO_3 is worth $63 base price only in 60 percent plus WO_3 concentrates meeting Government specifications. Concentrates acceptable to the U. S. Vanadium Corporation are bought on a sliding scale that ranges from $31 to $45 for grades of 5 percent to 45 percent plus WO_3. Prices are as of this year.

(6) Ore ranging from .4 to 0.499 percent WO_3 and acceptable to the U. S. Vanadium Corporation is bought for $33 per unit of contained WO_3. Thus 0.42 percent WO_3 ore is worth only $13.86 per ton.

(7) There is no proof in the file that the two ore shipments averaged .71 percent WO_3. In a letter by Epstein dated January 9, 1952, mention is made that the underground workings of adit No. 1 would furnish mill heads of plus .75 percent WO_3 with a minimum of selective mining and sorting. In a letter dated January 17, 1952, we informed Mr. Epstein that reconsideration of his application would be held in abeyance until receipt of the settlement sheets from the two mills as he had promised the Field Team. To date these have not been received.

The rest of the figures are "Greek" to me. Mr. Gentry's memorandum of December 26, 1951, shows assays of seven samples by Wisenhauer in ink and the Field Team's samples in pencil. The former are high. While Epstein was here he did speak of a sample that U. S. Vanadium reanalyzed, obtaining a higher result, but I am sure that it did not pertain to the shipment. If my recollection is correct, Epstein told me that the U. S. Vanadium assay of the shipment was 0.13 plus per cent WO_3 as reported to him. I believe Epstein did say that the sample he took of the ore before shipment to U. S. Vanadium assayed .7 percent WO_3. Gentry on August 22 and 24 took two samples of part of the broken ore before shipment to U. S. Vanadium that assayed .02 and .03 percent WO_3 (See field report.)

(8) See item 7 above.

(9) Epstein told me that possibly the better ore was left on the walls when the shipments were mined. Also that he was going to send a trial shipment to a new mill or laboratory in Los Angeles to see if he could secure convincing information concerning his grade of ore.

April 14, 1952

Memorandum

To: Acting Administrator, DMEA

From: Iron and Ferro-Alloy Division, DMEA

Subject: Mr. George W. Hochester's letter of April 7, 1952
Docket No. DMA 45-Tungsten
Tungsten Associates, Ltd.
The Mono Ore and Mono Extension Groups of Claims
Mono County, California

I have reviewed the subject docket and am noting below a few comments as to certain paragraphs which I have numbered.

(1) There has been relatively little delay on the part of DMEA. The Field Team report was received October 8, 1951, by DMA, after two field examinations of the subject property had been made. The second examination was made because the assays of samples taken during the first examination were low. The second examination substantiated the results of the first examination. The various divisions of DMEA were organized in late November and processing of the docket started shortly thereafter. The application was denied December 20, 1951.

(2) Mr. Lemmon states that both he and Mr. Geehan told the company that it could not expect much more in the nature of ore reserves than those indicated by the Van Voorhis' report. The company did not accept the commodity men's interpretation of the report but believed Osterholt's larger figure gave a truer picture.

(3) We have no information concerning the conferences that were held in Reno, Nevada. How could the work and its cost be set up before field examination?

Apparently Messrs. Epstein and Peterson conferred with Messrs. Geehan and Lemmon in January 1951, at which time they must have discussed a $75,000 exploration program. Mr. Geehan stated that the company did not submit a formal application for exploration aid but that the applications to RFC would be transferred to DMA in the near future. A two-phase program was discussed and Epstein and Peterson decided they were unable to take this step because a larger scale program was required to break even. They then requested $1,000,000 (See Geehan's memorandum of January 17, 1951.)*

* Since writing this, the matter was discussed with Mr. Geehan and he cannot recollect that a $75,000 loan was discussed. The $75,000 item of his memo is probably a typographical error.

COMMENT:

It appears to me that the burden of proof lies with Mr. Epstein and not with us. For analysis of engineering reports submitted by Epstein, see my original undated letter of denial that was not sent to him.

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

GCSelfridge:ls
4/14/52

cc: Docket
Admn. Reading File
G. C. Selfridge

File.

Dma-45

1T7A

On January 31, 1952 Assistant Secretary Robert R. Rose, Jr., sent letter to Hon. Wayne Morse, U. S. Senate, transmitting a copy of a memorandum from Mr. Mittendorf to Sec'y Rose, the last paragraph of which states that Mr. Epstein visited Washington and met with Commodity Chiefs, etc., and told of denial of his application. That ore shipped to Red Hill Mill had assayed only 0.134% tungsten. "It is presumed that this grade is far below the minimum grade acceptable under the usual purchase schedules and that, consequently, no payment was made for the ore." Also "It was the impression of the DMEA representative that Mr. Epstein was now less convinced as to the value of his tungsten ore and had decided to make further investigations at his own cost. The DMEA representative told Mr. Epstein that our denial of his present application would in no way prejudice our consideration of a new application based on new information.

JAN 17 1952

Mr. Harry Epstein, President
Tungsten Associates, Ltd.
275 So. Beverly Drive #5
Beverly Hills, California

Re: Docket No. DMA 45 - Tungsten
The Mono Ore and Mono Extension
Groups of Claims
Mono County, California

Dear Mr. Epstein:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 9, 1952, regarding the denial of the subject application.

The assays of the seven samples you submitted to the Reno office of the Bureau of Mines now have been received and added to the docket. It has been noted that their average is 0.42 percent WO_3 which grade would be below marginal for the type of ore occurrence and the operating conditions involved. However, at the moment that is beside the point.

Seemingly there is a conflict of views regarding the method of sampling. The samples you submitted were reported to be larger than those taken by the field team and, therefore, thought more representative. It is our understanding that the field team advised you that the best method to obtain truly representative results would be to make tonnage shipments to the Bishop mill where the tactite could be sampled automatically. We have been informed that a shipment of tactite from the underground working, where Van Voorhis' sampling indicated 1.0 percent ore, was sent to Bishop and one was also sent to the Red Hill mill. The material sent was thought to be of a grade that would be comparable to future run of mine ore. The results of the shipments were promised the field team to incorporate in the report. You informed us by telephone that the shipment to the Bishop mill fell below the Company's cut off grade.

Before reconsidering the application, we would appreciate copies of the settlement sheets from the two cases as provided. Until we receive these, we must hold in abeyance any future action on the application.

Sincerely yours,

C. O. Mitzendorf

Acting Administrator
Rubber Synthetic Replacement
Administration

OCSelfridge:lm
1/16/52

cc: Admn. Reading File
Dodge
R. W. Graham, UCRM
E. M. Lemmon, UCRS
Field Spec Reg. III
O. C. Selfridge

Never mailed BCL

Mr. Harry Epstein, President
Tungsten Associates, Ltd.
275 South Beverly Drive #5
Beverly Hills, California

Re: Docket No. [illegible] 45-Tungsten
The Home Ore and Home Extension
Groups of Claims
Inyo County, California

Dear Mr. Epstein:

This is in response to your recent telephonic conversation with Mr. G. C. Selfridge concerning the status of the subject application.

We have reviewed the application in detail, in conjunction with data made available to us by other Government Agencies, and have noted the following:

(1) In Mr. Sterholt's report mention is made of 35,456 tons of proven ore and 264,841 tons of inferred ore but no grade is given. He states that one set of seven spectrographic analyses was not encouraging from the production standpoint. The arithmetic average of another set of 21 assays is 0.326 WO_3. Another statement says that the tungsten samples on the Home Extension claims 1, 2, 4, 7 were not high enough to be worth mining.

(2) In Mr. Van Voorhis' report the statement is made that the samples (two for each deposit) were taken to give an average grade for the orebody sampled. The assays of the samples averaged 0.57 percent WO_3. The samples on the 4-A assayed 1.0% WO_3 and it was there that the subsequent underground work was done. He also states that the area has been deeply eroded and that the various deposits are very similar and apparently confined to definite stratigraphic horizons. Mr. Van Voorhis recommended a fairly exhaustive surface sampling program and qualified his estimates on ore reserves by saying that they were based on meager information and were not conclusive.

(3) In the Perkin's report the description of the 4-A workings is given. It shows that the vein, present as a slip, was cut, passed and that the granite was reached before the vein was recognized. Only after drifting 44 feet to the south on the slip was ore encountered.

Further drifting showed that the ore shoot was only 38 feet long and that there was a second shoot 20 feet long starting at 95 feet. Between the ore shoots and to the face of the drift the vein averaged from 3 to 4 feet in width and assays ranged from traces to 0.33% WO_3. Reserves suggested by the underground work were estimated to be 2,388 tons averaging 1.11% WO_3. The individual assays used to make the calculations were not given. Mr. Perkins further added 140,000 tons to the inferred reserves estimated by Osterholt, thus making a total of 400,299 tons. No grade was given but 1.0% WO_3 was used in making cost calculations.

From the above information one received the impression that the expectable grade of the ore might be 0.50 percent WO_3. The limited underground work shows that the ore is discontinuous and variable in grade.

Subsequent sampling of the underground ore shoots did not check the reported assays which were much higher. The lower grade average is substantiated by the shipment sent to Bishop which fell below the cutoff value of 0.30 percent WO_3 as determined by the U. S. Vanadium Corporation. Although there may be criticism of the automatic sampling method it would seem doubtful that it would err as much as 100 percent which would show that the ore still is low grade at 0.6% WO_3.

No suggestion was noted in the descriptive material that indicated more likely places to do further work. This may be due to the fact that it is general in nature rather than detailed. It seems that the scheelite is localized, at least in part, by not only certain beds but also by fractures cutting the mineralized zones more or less normal to their strike. If this is true then the scheelite will be concentrated where the fractures are closer together.

Since most of the relatively short and narrow scheelite-bearing sections have not been sampled as recommended by Mr. Van Voorhis it would seem appropriate that Tungsten Associates did more sampling this coming season.

Based on the available information one can only conclude that the deposits are too limited in tonnage and grade possibilities to eventually support an economic operation under present conditions.

Therefore, we regret that we must deny your application for the exploration loan. If, in the future, you are able to present, in an application, data more favorable to the property than the present, we will gladly consider it.

Sincerely yours,

Acting Administrator,
Defense Minerals Exploration
Administration

GCSelfridge/bmj
12-12-51

cc to: Adm. Reading File
Mails and Files
Mr. Mittendorf
Mr. Selfridge
Mr. Geehan
Mr. Thayer
Region III Docket

I-7 A

Memorandum January 8, 1952

TO: Under Secretary Searles

FROM: C. O. Mittendorf
Acting Administrator

SUBJECT: Status of DMA-45 - Tungsten Associates, Ltd.

Current Status

On December 20, 1951 Mr. Epstein, President of subject firm, was advised that his application for an exploration project was denied for the reason that geologic criteria indicated that the orebodies will be small, discontinuous, and of a low grade, as already shown in the present underground workings.

Background

During August 1950 Tungsten Associates made application to the RFC for a loan of $750,000, to be used for mine rehabilitation and construction of a 300-ton per day mill. The proposed method of repayment for such a loan was to be from the profits derived from the sale of tungsten concentrate.

Concurrent with this application, the firm requested a procurement contract through GSA. Since deliveries under any procurement contract would be contingent upon granting of the loan request, GSA deferred further action on the procurement contract until the loan application had been handled.

DMA's first meeting with the applicant took place on January 11, 1951, at which time the RFC and GSA applications were discussed. At that date DMA had not received a formal application from the subject firm. It was the opinion of DMA that inconclusive evidence had been presented as to the sufficiency of ore reserves, and that a Field examination would have to be made before DMA could make a definitive recommendation on the matter. Tungsten Associates felt that the existing engineering reports were sufficient and submitted that a further Field examination would unduly delay the project, since the mine was already inaccessible due to winter snow. DMA suggested the possibility of casting the project in two phases, the first to be a small project which could be justified on the basis of proven ore, and the second phase to cover large plant installations after additional ore reserves had been proved. This suggestion was unacceptable to Tungsten Associates.

A Field examination was made when the property became accessible early in the summer of 1951. Samples taken by the Field Team assayed less than 0.2% WO_3. It was the conclusion of the Field Team that the mine could be considered only in the prospect stage and that insufficient tonnage and grade of ore did not justify favorable consideration of the loan application.

Tungsten Associates protested the findings of the DMA Field Team and submitted that the samples taken by them were not representative of the true value of the ore. The Regional Field Team thereupon re-examined the property and suggested an alternate proposal of undertaking an exploration program amounting to $160,000, of which the Government would contribute 75 percent. Although it is understood that Tungsten Associates were willing to participate in such an exploration project, no formal application has been made by the firm.

Between the examinations made last summer, at a time when the grade of ore was under controversy, the operators undertook the mining of a test lot of ore to be milled at a nearby custom mill. Presumably this was a practical step on the part of the operator to prove that his estimates of the value of the ore were correct. DMA learned on December 11, 1951 that the 136 tons of ore delivered to the U.S. Vanadium plant at Bishop assayed less than 0.3% WO_3, which is the minimum grade limit of ore that the milling firm will accept. Consequently, it is assumed that no payment was made for that lot of ore. Tungsten Associates did not reveal how much less their ore assayed than the minimum cutoff limit of 0.3% WO_3. DMA made a careful review of all the available information and concluded that the deposits were too limited in tonnage and grade possibilities to support an economic operation, and accordingly, denied the exploration project.

A memorandum received on January 2, 1952 from the Regional Field Office states that Mr. Epstein, President of Tungsten Associates, has continuously reported his dissatisfaction with the Field Team's method of sampling. The Regional Field Office has continued to express its confidence in its own samples. Mr. Epstein has re-sampled some of the locations which the Field Team previously sampled, including locations which were not sampled by the Field Team, and has submitted the results of seven samples taken by himself and not in the presence of Government representatives. The arithmetical average of the seven samples taken by Mr. Epstein are 0.42% WO_3. Mr. Epstein has requested that the results of the recent sample be made a part of his official file.

Mr. Glenn Gentry, a Bureau of Mines Engineer assigned to the Regional Field Team, was the co-author of the Government reports on this property. Fortunately, Mr. Gentry is enroute to Washington, where he will be assigned to the DMEA office for a period of two months. Additional details involving the subject application, not in the written record, might be available after Mr. Gentry's arrival, should you wish to discuss the matter further.

C. O. Mittendorf

COMittendorf/fw
cc: Admr. Reading File
Mails & Files
Mr. Mittendorf
Mr. Geehan
Mr. Lemmon
Mr. Selfridge

Field of Minerals, Div. III

A. C. Johnson, Chief, Mining Div., Reg. III Dec. 26, 1951

Glenn G. Gentry, Mining Eng., Bureau of Mines, Reg. III

Docket DMA-85, Tungsten Associates, Ltd.,
Mono County, Calif.

In answer to a letter from Mr. H. G. Miller, Executive Officer, DMEA Field Team, Region III, dated Dec. 21, 1951, inquiring as to the location of 7 samples from the above property with reference to samples taken by engineers of the U. S. Bureau of Mines, Region III.

On Sept. 5, 1951, Mr. Harry Epstein, President of Tungsten Associates, Ltd., visited the Reno office of the U. S. Bureau of Mines, Region III, and advised that he had taken samples No.'s 1 to 7, inclusive, in the following locations:

Sample No. 1 - From ore dump at collar of winze above south drift
0.32 WO_3 over No. 1 Tunnel. (Note: This dump not sampled by U.S.B.M.).

Sample No. 2 - Outcrop at collar of winze. (Note: Reported by
0.55 Epstein to be below U.S.B.M. samples No's. 121-127-128).

Sample No. 3 - From ore dump at southeast end of 4A outcrop.
0.41 60 ft. south of U.S.B.M. sample No. 121. (Note: This dump not sampled by U.S.B.M.).

Sample No. 4 - Across back of No. 1 Tunnel about 20 ft. above level
0.26 between middle and south end stopes, in south drift. (Note: U.S.B.M. samples in this area would be No's. 118-116-113-114-130-139).

Sample No. 5 - North end of No. 3 raise at end of south drift, No. 1
0.36 Tunnel. (Note: U.S.B.M. samples in this area would be No's. 107-136-137-138).

Sample No. 6 - From ore dump at open cut at south end of property on
0.31 B2 claim. (Note: This dump not sampled by U.S.B.M.).

Sample No. 7 - Ore in place on 3 faces, from open cut at south end of
0.72 property on B2 claim. (Note: Face of this cut sampled by U.S.B.M. No. 133).

There were no Bureau of Mines engineers present at the time these samples were taken and we therefore have no information other than that reported by Mr. Epstein who states the sampling was done by himself and his employees in the standard manner of channel sampling.

Glenn G. Gentry

Glenn G. Gentry,

George B. Holderer

October 9, 1951

T. P. Thayer

DMA-45 Tungsten Associates, Ltd., Mono County, Calif.

The merits of the proposed exploration appear to be summarized in the following quotation from the field team report:

	Tons	% WO_3	% Mo
Measured ore	None		
Indicated ore	1,630	0.0855	0.01
Inferred ore	12,568	0.088	0.013
	14,198		

When the tungsten situation becomes so far advanced technologically that tactite containing 0.0855 % WO_3 is considered as ore instead of rock, this proposal should be seriously considered; until then the deposit appears to offer very little chance of becoming commercial except for a few tens of tons of hand-picked ore. Only three assays found as much as 0.47% WO_3; what more needs be said?

The cost estimates appear to be no more realistic than the reserve figures, but I defer to your judgment on them.

Dwight Lemmon is supposed to have visited the deposits October 4, and you may wish to hold the docket until you hear from him. I do not see how he could come to a much different conclusion than I, namely, that the proposal should be denied.

TPThayer:gt

Tungsten Associates DMEA 45

All material transferred to docket DMEA 2566