

Line and position coordinates are truncated AMG as used in original data and Pasminco report.  
(drill ratings still need to be assessed and possibly re-rated in light of detailed geological knowledge of the area).

| row | LINE (northing) | POSITION (easting) | target depth | drill rating | NOTES  |
|-----|-----------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--|
| 1   | 71200 N         | 3100 E             | 80m+         | no           | A respectable though broad chargeability zone at depth in a low conductivity region. Not really "tight" enough to define a good drill target. See also line 71000N, 3110E.   |
| 2   | "               | 3375 E             | 30-50m       | good?        | Strong coincident chargeable/conductive anomaly. Strong boundary at 3330E with anomalous zone to the east. Anomalism extends from close to surface down through the whole model section. As discussed, the anomaly may well be explained by conductive shale unit(s) if these are in fact present at the location. Pasminco report recommended checking existing drillhole SVD89-2 for possibly relevant information.  |
| 3   | 71000 N         | 3110 E             | 30-60m       | fair         | A good subsurface IP chargeability source. Very slight elevation in conductivity but this is barely significant. This appears to be a better defined target along the same approx NS strike as the similar but less well defined anomalous zone on line 71200N, 3100E.   |
| 4   | "               | 3350 E             | 20-40m       | good?        | Strong coincident chargeable/conductive anomaly. Strong boundaries at 3300E for conductivity and 3330E for chargeability with anomalous zone to the east. Anomalism extends from close to surface down through the whole model section. Very similar in character to line 71200N, 3375E. As discussed, the anomaly may well be explained by conductive shale unit(s) if these are in fact present at the location. Pasminco report recommended checking existing drillhole SVD89-2 for possibly relevant information.  |
| 5   | 70800 N         | 3150 E             | 70-80m       | no           | Indication of a moderate IP chargeability response at depth, but on the extreme edge of the survey line and not adequately defined. Uncertain, but a possible ~NS strike continuation of the anomaly on line 71000N, 3110E but with a more elevated conductivity, or a ~NNE strike continuation of the anomaly on line 70500N, 3010E.  |
| 6   | 70600 N         | 2825 E             | 50-100m      | poor         | A moderate subsurface IP chargeability source. No associated conductivity high. Appears to be an along strike continuation of line 70500N, 2760E and the latter would be a better target.  |
| 7   | 70500 N         | 2760 E             | 30-50m       | fair         | A reasonable subsurface IP chargeability source, dipping but weakening to the west. No associated conductivity high.   |
| 8   | "               | 2920 E             | 25-50m       | ?            | A good subsurface conductivity source, but only a weak IP chargeability anomaly that is offset 50m to the west. Rating should probably be low due to the poor chargeability anomalism.   |
| 9   | "               | 3010 E             | 20-50m       | fair         | A reasonable subsurface IP chargeability source with weakly elevated conductivity. May be continuation of anomalism on line 70150N, 2810E but not as strong - this idea is reinforced by the presence of the offset conductivity high about 50m to the west at 2920E which is reminiscent of the pattern seen on line 70150N where a region of stronger conductivity at about 2750E is similarly offset to the west of the chargeability anomaly.  |
| 10  | 70300 N         | 2400 E - 2600 E    | 0-30m        | no           | Moderate surficial chargeability over this region. Elevated surficial conductivities over most of the length of this line, but slightly less elevated in the region of the chargeability region. Surficial chargeability and conductive zone similar to other lines.   |
| 11  | 70150 N         | 2200 E             | 10-20m       | no           | Same as line 69800N, 2120E.  |
| 12  | "               | 2375 E             | 10-20m       | poor         | A moderate IP chargeability source but shallow and limited extent. Very weak elevated conductivity. More likely to be part of shallow surficial anomaly evident on adjacent lines 70000N and 70300N  |
| 13  | "               | 2810 E             | 50-70m       | good         | A good subsurface IP chargeability source. Correlates with an elevated conductivity region at similar depth, although the better conductivity is offset about 50m to the west. In absolute terms the conductivities are not high at 4mS/m (=resistivity 250 ohm-m).  |
| 14  | 70000 N         | -                  | -            | no           | Nothing of target interest. Surficial chargeability and conductive zones similar to other lines.   |
| 15  | 69800 N         | west of 1950 E     | 0-30m        | no           | Moderate strength shallow IP chargeability zone, with shallow to mid-depth conductivity zone. This is possibly the first line showing the chargeable/conductive region that the Pasminco report says correlates with a topographic feature. The topographic high trends roughly NW-SE and similar chargeability/conductivity features can be seen to the south on lines 69600N and 69400N that straddle diagonally over the ridge.   |
| 16  | "               | 2120 E             | 0-30m        | no           | A broad zone of elevated chargeability 2050-2350E extending through the bottom of the model section. This whole zone is generally associated with a shallow surface (0-30m) region of conductivity similar in character to that of other lines. A similar chargeable/conductive pattern is seen to be starting on the western end of line 70150N and in weaker form on the western part of line 70000N   |
| 17  | "               | 2600 E             | 70-100m      | fair         | A good subsurface IP chargeability source, although not as strong as 70150N, and not closed off to the east in the new modelling. Indications of an associated deep conductivity response. The zone of chargeable/conductive material extends to the west and shallows but with weaker anomalism, culminating in a surficial conductivity high at 2490E.   |
| 18  | 69600 N         | 1750 E - 2000 E    | 0-50m        | no           | Moderate strength shallow IP chargeability zone, with mid-depth conductivity zone. Correlated with topographic ridge; see line 69800N, 1950E.  |
| 19  | "               | 2100 E             | 70-100m      | no           | A moderate but wide subsurface IP chargeability anomaly. Probable along-strike continuation of anomalous zone centred at line 69800N, 2120 E.  |
| 20  | 69400 N         | east of ~1750 E    | 0-30m        | no           | Moderate to good surficial chargeability over much of the line, with a mid-depth but patchy conductivity zone. Correlated with topographic ridge; see line 69800N, 1950E.  |
| 21  | 69200 N         | 1875 E             | 0-50m        | no           | Moderate strength shallow IP chargeability and elevated conductivity zone. Correlated with southern side of topographic ridge; see line 69800N, 1950E.   |
| 22  | 69000 N         | -                  | -            | no           | No data collected in middle of line. Nothing of target interest in the data available.   |
| 23  | 68700 N         | 1510 E             | 0-20m        | no           | A poor surficial IP chargeability response with a very weak conductive zone surrounding it below.  |
| 24  | 68500 N         | 1200 E - 1450 E    | 0-30m        | no           | A good surficial IP chargeability response but very weak and patchy conductive throughout the section. This chargeability zone also correlates with another (different) topographic high striking to the WSW.  |
| 25  | "               | 1650 E             | -            | no           | <i>An example of the effect of topography - The Pasminco modelling (which did not account for topography) shows a good conductive zone at this position whereas the new modelling does not. This difference can be explained by the topographic effect of the valley on the measured data; the measured voltage in the valley is lower than would be expected on a flat earth, and modelling the measured data without accounting for topography means the lesser current is converted to a lower resistivity (ie. higher conductivity) in the model than is actually present at the valley's position. The new modelling, having accounted for topography, does not show the valley zone as a good conductor.</i> |