

June 9, 1983

Mr. Carl Zuber
Inland Recovery Group Ltd.
610 - 835 Dunsmuir
Vancouver, B. C.
V6C 1N5

Re: Work on Thorn Property

Dear Carl:

In reviewing the data on the Thorn Property, I concluded that there are 4 targets presently known which warrant further investigation and I will list these targets with suggestions for exploration work as follows:

1. Target D is the massive sulfide float which carries the good copper, silver and gold values. Field geologists should locate these boulders, prospect the area and try to determine, from the lay of the land, which direction they could have come from. If several boulders occur in one location, it is probable that they just came a short distance down the slope. The potential source area should be checked with a VLF unit and for this purpose I suggest a grid of lines uphill from the float. We may need to run lines in two directions as we are not certain of the general strike of all mineralized zones in the area. In this case, and for any of the following targets, detailed soil sampling should be done over any VLF anomalies. Please note that signals from U.S. submarine stations are used. Suitable stations are at Seattle, Hawaii, and Cutler (Maine). Lines must be oriented within 45° of the direction to the signal station and therefore the field geologist must be flexible and confer with the geophysicist regarding optimum direction of lines.
2. The area of B Float which has boulders of good grade mineralization (in quartz) should also be redone using the same technique. I reviewed the work done previously in this area and I do not believe that the I.P. work and the drilling have eliminated the target.
3. The best geochem anomaly that I have found in my limited amount of silt sampling occurs at the northeast contact of the stock on the south side of Camp Creek. This is in an area of considerable timber. This timbered area should be investigated by the same technique (the grid of VLF work followed by geochemical sampling over any VLF anomalies).

4. Target C, previously obtained by Anaconda geologists, has not been explored properly. The area is one of considerable vegetation and overburden and a similar technique is recommended for this area.

In addition, to the investigation of these four specific targets, I suggest that the other showings be re-examined; however, in most cases these have been adequately eliminated by the previous geologists. This previous work indicated that the showings A, E, G, and J do not have too much potential. However, showings F, I, L, and M should be re-examined and reconsidered in view of the intense leaching that has gone on in the vicinity of these four targets. This is a highly pyritic, weathered and leached area of the complex.

The contact area of the igneous complex with the overlying sediments (east of Camp Creek) merits some attention; however, this would be merely of a prospecting nature and would not, at this time, merit much time. Two days of geological mapping should indicate the attitude of the sedimentary rocks and the approximate contact. I suggest that this contact area receive a few crosslines of VLF work and of geochemical sampling. This geological structure, which is presumably sedimentary strata overlying an area of volcanoclastic rocks, could constitute a trap for mineralization and is probably the best bet for a strataform type of deposit.

Detailed stream geochemistry should be done in all of the drainages and such samples should be run for copper, lead, zinc, gold, silver and arsenic.

In conjunction with this above program, geological observations must be made by the field geologist and in places some detailed mapping may be necessary over limited areas. However, until we gain more data I would not suggest a lot of time be devoted to making a more refined geological map.

Yours very truly,

J. R. Woodcock

JRW/em