Metall Mining Corp.
3rd Floor, 311 Water St.
Vancouver V6B 1B8

Tuesday 4 October 1994

Wilfred Tsang
Min-En Labs,
705 West 15th St.
North Vancouver V7M 1T2

Dear Wilfred,

I am having some difficulty interpreting biogeochemical survey results from the Wolf Property. It appears that there is much more gold in samples taken in 1992 than those analysed from essentially the same area in 1993. The following map shows line profiles of Au biogeochemistry, with the areas sampled and analysed in 1992 indicated; all other samples were taken and analysed in 1993. Veining and mineralization in the eastern part of the area strikes approximately north-south, and on the basis of the 1992 sampling alone seemed to produce a biogeochemical Au anomaly 900m long. However, the 1993 fill-in samples did not contain any anomalous Au values. All of the 1992 and 1993 samples were taken from the same kind of trees, lodgepole pine, and sent to Min-En for INAA. It appears to me that either the analytical method must have changed, or the Au content of tree bark depends on the month or weather. The 1992 samples were taken in June and July, but the 1993 samples were taken in July and August. You report a detection limit of 0.1 ppb Au for both sets of samples, but the 1992 analyses were much more responsive.

Can you explain the remarkable difference between the 1992 and 1993 analyses? It appears to me that the analytical method must have changed. Perhaps the irradiation position in the reactor differed, or the irradiation times, and thus the total thermal neutron fluxes. Or maybe the cooling times between irradiation and counting differed, or the counting time. Or maybe the detectors were changed, was one coaxial and the other coplanar? Were the same standards used? Were the gamma ray spectra analysed in the same way: were peak heights used one year, and integrated peak areas the other year? Were the same corrections made for interfering isotopes?

Yours sincerely,

David Love

(handwritten margin notes:) Changed reactors

changed tube location
- smaller tube
- higher flux - improve
- should d.l.

6-7 days never >8

Count Time

Same type!

Same software
same corrections
Standards?