

TELETYPE MEMO

TO: R. E. Thurmond, Anvil Mining Corporation, ^{Faro} Yukon Territory,
 FROM: H. L. Ames

To clarify new dryer proposal have compiled following review. Obtaining more definite data lead dryer operation and will phone you at Faro 9.00 A.M. July 12

- 1 - Decision June 15 to purchase stainless steel 5 x 40 dryer as a spare
- 2 - I suggested taking opportunity to consider larger dryer with due regard to:
 - (a) Installed cost
 - (b) Capacity
 - (c) Present and future peak load requirements
 - (d) Compatibility with available space

3 - Stansteel advise next sizes 6x40 and 7x48

4 - Capacity Table

	Case A	Case B	Case C
Water In %	10.5	10.5	12.0
Water Out %	6.0	4.5	4.5
Oil Cons. GPT	1.3	1.7	2.1
5 x 40 DSTPH	20	15	12
6 x 40	29	22	17
7 x 48	40	30	24

Note: Case B most probable operating conditions

- 5 - Decision to buy either 6 x 40 or 7 x 48
- 6 - Idea developed all lead to new dryer and No.3 held as spare
- 7 - Schaefer given this information July 8 and we indicated that we favoured 7 x 48 carbon steel shell with burner and scrubber sized for 20% to 40% over existing dryers and asked him to obtain approximate costs and technical information re this suggestion.
- 8 - Schaefer's telephone July 9 disconcerting. Lohead Haggerty advise basic cost 7 x 48 stainless dryer \$145,000 and they had no experience with carbon steel and therefore take no responsibility.
- 9 - This cost prohibitive. Therefore if new operating data precludes carbon steel for lead drying a stainless 6 x 40 seems only alternative. We have used both carbon steel and stainless for zinc satisfactorily but am not sure about lead.
- 10 - If carbon steel OK for 7 to 10 years alternative of 6 X 40 and 7 x 48 remains. One is little small for peak loads and the other is ~~large~~ large for average loads compared to a 5 x 40. A 6 x 40 would reduce materially the number of excessive build ups. Also present thinking re future is that if milling rate increased lead grade would be reduced resulting in same lead con tonnage.
- 11 - Estimate cost, ^{7 x 48} of carbon steel shell dryer \$75,000 presumably the same as 6 x 40 stainless shell dryer. In all cases hood, fan, scrubber, feeders etc requires stainless.
- 12 - Am not happy buying ^{small} auxiliaries with large dryer as this offsets future flexibility. However larger ones may increase 7 x 48 cost by \$20,000 making \$95,000 and may cause control problems on average tonnages.
- 13 - Although Anvil overall con tonnages indicate a 7 x 48 dryer somewhere in line, revised operating parameters and continually higher cost estimates raise doubts as to its economic advisability. Probably I will get some more conclusive information within two hours and you, Corwin and I can come to an agreement over phone which dryer is in Anvil's best interest.