

## **Jovan Silic & Associates Pty Ltd**

77 Argo St, South Yarra VIC 3141

Ph: 03 8420 6200 Fax: 03 8420 6299

Mobile: 0414 613 635 E-mail: [jsilic@bigpond.com](mailto:jsilic@bigpond.com)

### **M E M O**

**To :** Mick Skirka  
**Copy :** Angela Lorrigan  
**From:** Jovan Silic  
**Re:** Chamberlain Target  
**Date:** August 25, 2007


---

### **INTRODUCTION**

Prior to issuing the report of the interpretation of DHEM data from CP354 , it may be of some value to assess the impending report and the previous attempts to drill the Chamberlain target by considering the following summary of the history of detection and drilling of the Chamberlain target .

#### **HISTORY OF DETECTION AND DRILLING OF CHMBERLAIN TARGET**

- (1) Chamberlain target was first recognized in a 10 year old UTEM data set as “subtle “but not completely surveyed anomaly appearing the end of number of survey lines . The “ weak “ anomalous response was interpreted as most likely being due to a target at depths of 500 meters and more and outside the limits ( to the west of ) the survey area .
- (2) Single follow up of EM data confirmed the presence of a deep source at depths of 600 – 700 meters. From this single loop of data a vertical or relatively vertical target was interpreted at 377400 E on line 5371300 N ( Figure 1 ) .
- (3) Drill hole CP 348 targeting the conductor location appeared to have lifted well before target area and did not reach target depth. In fact at the target easting it was some 200 – 300 meters above the interpreted target ( Figure 1 ) .
- (4) Drill CP353 was subsequently drilled aimed at the target location. This drill hole however, although reaching target depth did not lift as anticipated and did not reach target lateral location at 377400 E . (Figure 1 ) .



**Figure 1. Chamberlain Section 537100 N: Interpreted Conductor**

#### DOWN HOLE EM SURVEYS IN CP353 and CP348

- (1) DHEM surveys in CP353 and CP348 by utilizing a number of loops to energize the conductive target not only confirmed the presence of a substantial target at depth, but more importantly **demonstrated that the conductor( s) geometry was much more complicated than was inferred from a single loop of surface EM data . In fact a three conductor model ( possibly joined as a fold ) was required to explain the observed four loop DHEM data set ( Figure 1 ) .**
- (2) Drilling of this interpretation but **essentially targeting the same area as was recommend on the basis of a single loop surface EM data set** resulted in the intersection of one of the conductors ( or one part of a possible fold ) by drill hole CP 354 ( Figure 2 ) .




Figure 2 DHEM CP 354 Loop 4: Axial (Z) Component

## CONCLUSION

Careful analysis of old and new surface and DHEM data sets has resulted in a successful identification and intersection of a conductive target at depth of 600 meters and more. Failure of two drill holes to intersect the conductive target was largely the result of **drill holes not reaching the designated target area** ( i.e. drill hole CP 348 lifted well before reaching the target area , whereas CP 353 did not lift sufficiently to intersect the conductor ) .

In hindsight though, it can be speculated that collecting more than one loop of surface data ( not common practice unless there is enough evidence to warrant it ) may have resulted in a more accurate interpretation of targets geometry prior to targeting the conductor with the first drill hole CP 348 .