

MINERAL HOLDINGS AUSTRALIA PTY LTD

**RETENTION LICENCE 1/2005
HOGARTH CREEK, NW TASMANIA**

**ANNUAL REPORT ON EXPLORATION
TO JUNE 2011**

Compiled by

**T W Dickson
5 Crouch Court,
Doncaster Vic 3108
1st May 2011**

For

**Mineral Holdings Australia Pty Ltd
11 Kent Court,
Toorak Vic 3124**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

	Page No
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	4
2.0 GEOLOGY.....	4
3.0 PREVIOUS EXPLORATION AND EVALUATION....	5
4.0 CURRENT EXPLORATION AND MARKETING.....	7
5.0 CONCLUSIONS.....	7
6.0 REFERENCES.....	7
7.0 KEYWORDS.....	8
PLAN 1. Location diagram	10
PLAN 2. Geology and Exploration.	11
Appendix 1 Stim Labs Report.	12
Appendix 2 Burnie lab Sizing report	20

RL 1/2005 HOGARTH CREEK, NW TASMANIA, ANNUAL REPORT 2011

ABSTRACT

This report gives a review of the marketing and exploration work carried out by Mineral Holdings Australia Pty. Ltd. over the past 12 months on RL 1/2005.

The licence covers 5 sq km in the Dip Ranges and encloses the Thomas Mountain Silica Mine.

The licence covers the Detention Quartzite of the Rocky Cape Group and the target of exploration is silica, silica sand and quartzite for the chemical, metallurgical glass and coal seam methane industries.

Previous exploration by Mineral Holdings Australia Pty. Ltd. and its joint venture partners has outlined a substantial inventory of potential silica products in the RL namely 0.35Mt of hard, silicified quartzite, 1.55Mt of hard sandstone, 0.65Mt of poorly consolidated, soft sandstone and 2.45Mt of very soft unconsolidated sand. Some infill drilling would be required to raise this resource estimate to the Indicated Level (JORC Code)

MHA was asked by Temco to supply two separate bulk samples of quartzite from Hogarth Creek to determine its suitability in the manufacture of Ferro – silicon at the Temco plant in Bell Bay. About 8,000 tonnes of quartzite was mined and crushed on site and 5,000 tonnes of sized material was shipped to Bell Bay. A full report has not yet been supplied but verbal information suggests the Hogarth Creek material provided superior furnace returns but the cost of transport to Bell Bay more than offset the cost of inferior local quartzite.

Marketing of the quartzite and frac sand resources has continued. A site visit was made by staff from Wacker Chemie AG and representative quartzite samples taken. Stim Labs have also evaluated samples of frac sand from the no 1 and 2 pits with excellent results.

RL 1/2005 HOGARTH CREEK, NW TASMANIA, ANNUAL REPORT 2010

1.0 INTRODUCTION

RL 1/2005 was applied for by Mineral Holdings Australia Pty Ltd on 21st February 2005 and was granted on 15th June 2005. RL 1/2005 covers the site of the Thomas Mountain Silica Resource which was originally covered by CML 8M/1989 and 1W/1088. Under its policy of revoking non performing mining leases Mineral Resources Tasmania suggested that a Retention Licence would be a more appropriate title for the marketing and industrial testing activities currently being pursued by MHA. Consequently RL1/2005 was granted and the mineral leases cancelled.

The Thomas Mountain Mine and prospect occurs in the northern Dip Range about 25 km south-west of Wynyard and 20km south-east of a deep water harbour at Port Latta. Access is via the township of Montumana on the Bass Highway, 25 km west of Wynyard, thence 6 km south along Montumana and Newhaven roads to a turn-off just east of Hogarths Creek.

Over the past several years, MHA has had discussions with a number of industrial companies, within Australia and overseas, as potential customers or developers of the deposit. There has been considerable interest in the potential for producing “frac” sands from the site and renewed interest in the area as a source of fine silica sand for the glass and specialized silica products.

Bulk samples of quartzite was taken for full scale furnace trials at Temco Bell Bay

2.0 GEOLOGY

Resources of high grade quartzite have been reported in various government publications as occurring within the Proterozoic rocks of north- west Tasmania. The better quartzite occurred within the Detention Quartzite sub-group and rocks of this sub-group underlie most of the licence area..

Gee(1971) described the Proterozoic sequence within the Rocky Cape Group from youngest to oldest as – the Jacob Quartzite (1130m in thickness), the Irby Siltstone (760m) and the Detention Sub-group (1400m). Gee suggested The Detention Sub-group contained about 10% siltstone in beds from a few metres to more than 80 metres in thickness. The Rocky Cape Group, in turn, overlies the Cowrie Siltstone which was at least 2400m in thickness.

Structurally the Detention Quartzite is folded into a tight series of anticlines and synclines with north-east trending and dipping axes with folds becoming overturned in the east resulting in north-west dipping beds at 45 degrees or above.

Gee (1971) described the quartzites as uniformly fine grained orthoquartzites with 99% quartz grains and a granular to glassy texture depending on the degree of cementation by silica. Turner (1989) on the other hand preferred to call the mature, quartzose, sandy sediments quartz arenites and attributes their variable physical character as mostly due to variable silicification and occasionally to metamorphism.

The silica resources currently outlined in the licence are 0.35Mt of very hard, silicified sandstone or quartzite, 1.55 Mt of hard sandstone, 0.65 Mt of poorly consolidated or soft weathered sandstone and 2.45 Mt of unconsolidated sand. The potential uses of the resources include silicon metal, silica sand and quartzite for the chemical, metallurgical, glass petroleum and coal seam gas industries.

3.0 PREVIOUS EXPLORATION AND EVALUATION

There has been a long history of exploration by MHA and a series of joint venture partners for a wide range of silica products at Thomas Mountain. Details of that work were provided in the 2007 report.

In 1993/4 MHA developed 42 hammer drill holes along 8 sections for 666m in the area SW of Hogarths Creek. This has allowed a resource estimate to be made for an area of about 25 Ha extent to a depth of 10 metres extending south- west of the Quarry site. (Duncan (2005) estimated an inferred resource of **5 million tonnes** of siliceous material in the area just south of Hogarths Creek which breaks down to –

**0.35 Mt of very hard, silicified sandstone,
1.55 Mt of hard sandstone,
0.65 Mt of poorly consolidated, soft sandstone and
2.45 Mt of very soft sand**

Duncan suggested some infill drilling would be necessary to lift the resource to the Indicated level of the JORC Code. He also suggested a significant increase in resource was likely at depth and along strike to the NE and SW with an inferred 20 Mt of high grade sand and sandstone available as a conservative figure in the area of the Retention Licence.

In recent times considerable effort was put into testing the unconsolidated sand from Thomas Mountain as a propping agent in oil drilling. Dip Range sand was tested by **Stim Laboratories, Halliburton Services and Dowell Schlumberger** of the USA and **Santos and Amdel** in Australia. Tests were carried out on the 20/45 size range (US screen) which is the -850 to +420um fraction. Dip range sand is a fine / medium grained sand with a median value of about 250um with about 50% in the 20/45 size fraction

As summarized by Stim, the Dip Range sample passed the size analysis, the acid solubility test and the turbidity test but was slightly below standard for shape factor, grain clusters and crush resistance tests for deep wells. From the Amdel tests, it is found that the sand grains have a dramatic decrease in crush resistance at about 4000 psi which

would, according to Halliburton, restrict the use of the sand to shallow wells where less than 1200 psi is required in the recovery of methane gas from coal seams.

4.0 CURRENT EXPLORATION AND MARKETING

MHA was asked by Temco to supply two separate bulk samples of quartzite from Hogarth Creek to determine its suitability in the manufacture of Ferro – silicon at the Temco plant in Bell Bay. About 8,000 tonnes of quartzite was mined and crushed on site to +25 -60mm size and 5,000 tonnes of sized material was shipped to Bell Bay. A full report has not yet been supplied but verbal information suggests the Hogarth Creek material provided superior furnace returns but the cost of transport to Bell Bay more than offset the cost of inferior local quartzite. (Great material but cost of transport is too high)

Additional tests were carried out by STIM-LAB Inc. in February 2011 on the 16/30, 20/40 and 40/70 size ranges (US mesh screen). As summarized by STIM-LAB, the Dip Range sample passed the size analysis, the acid solubility test, the turbidity test, for shape factor, grain clusters and crush resistance tests for wells to 3,000 metres.

For the 16/30 mesh sand the sphericity of 0.8 and roundness of 0.7 were above the recommended greater than 0.6, and no clustered grains were observed. The acid soluble percent was 0.6% well below the recommended maximum of 2.0%. The silt test result of 8 FTU was well below the maximum allowed 250 FTU and the % fines of 8.7% at 3000 PSI is also well below the allowed maximum of 14%.

Likewise for the 20/40 mesh fraction the sphericity of 0.8 and roundness of 0.7 were above the recommended greater than 0.6, and 1 clustered grain was observed in 100 grains. The acid soluble percent was 0.7% well below the recommended maximum of 2.0%. The silt test result of 22 FTU was well below the maximum allowed 250 FTU and the % fines of 12.2% at 4000 PSI is also well below the allowed maximum of 14%.

The 40/70 fraction returned a sphericity of 0.7 and roundness of 0.6, which were equal to or above the recommended greater than 0.6, and 1 clustered grain was observed in 100 grains. The acid soluble percent was 1.1% well below the recommended maximum of 2.0%. The silt test result of 13 FTU was well below the maximum allowed 250 FTU and the % fines of 5.2% at 5000 PSI is also well below the allowed maximum of 8%.

A full copy of the STIM-LAB report is appended in Appendix 1.

Recently, MHA have attempted to determine if there is any systematic variation in grain size within the sand unit. As indicated in the table on the following page, there is some variation and most likely this is due to stratigraphic differences between the original sandstone units.

TABLE 1. SIZE ANALYSIS INDICATING PERCENTAGE OF EACH SAMPLE WITHIN THE SPECIFIED SIZE RANGE

<i>Sample</i>	<i>US Mesh Size Range</i>			
	<i>+20#</i>	<i>20-40#</i>	<i>40-60#</i>	<i>-60#</i>
<i>Pit No1</i>	-	54.5	25.0	20.5
<i>East end costean from No.1 pit</i>	5.0	45.0	28.0	22.0
<i>West side Pit No.1</i>	6.0	61.0	19.0	14.0
<i>Pit No.2</i>	-	58.0	19.0	23.0
<i>Start of track to No.2 Pit</i>	-	55.0	24.0	21.0
<i>Former ACI stockpile</i>	1.7	67.7	12.5	18.0
<i>1000t sand stockpile</i>	2.5	70.0	11.4	17.8
<i>Hole 30 at 5m</i>	2.5	50.0	27.5	25.0
<i>Hole 36 at 5m</i>	5.0	36.0	24.0	35.0
<i>Hole 36 at 17m</i>	2.0	30.0	35.0	33.0

A more recent size analysis is attached as Appendix 2.

Marketing of the quartzite and frac sand resources has continued. A site visit was made by staff from Wacker Chemie AG and representative quartzite samples taken. Stim Labs have also evaluated samples of frac sand from the no 1 and 2 pits with excellent results.

5.0 CONCLUSION

Temco have suggested the higher transport costs make the Thomas mountain quartzite uneconomic at this stage. However Wacker Chemie AG are taking considerable interest in the quartzite. They are currently evaluating samples of the quartzite.

Considerable interest in the potential for the Thomas Mountain mine to produce proppant sands for the expanding coal seam methane industry has also been generated. Some 40 to 60% of the unconsolidated sand falls within the favourable 20 to 40 mesh size range and in a commercial operation the run of mine material could be screened to produce a +30mm fraction of metallurgical silica, a 20 to 40 mesh fraction of frac sand and a -40 mesh fraction for glass sand. The deposit is too coarse for silica flour.

6.0 REFERENCES

Anon, April 1981. Report on Stage 2 – Geological Investigation of EL 43/1970 for Kaiser Aluminium. Longworth and McKenzie Pty. Ltd. TCR 81-1553.

Anon, June 1981. Report on Stage 3 – Preliminary Drilling of EL 43/1970 for Kaiser Aluminium. Longworth and McKenzie Pty. Ltd. TCR 81-1573.

Anon, Aug, 1994. Treatment of A High Grade Silica Sand for Gwalia Consolidated Ltd. Dip Range. Ammtec Ltd. TCR94-3652

Bacon, C.A. 1989. Silica. Miner. Resour. Tasm. 12.

Dickson, T.W., May 2008. Annual Report on Exploration to June 2008, Retention Licence 1/2005 Hogarth Creek NW Tasmania. Mineral Holdings Australia Pty.Ltd.

Dickson, T.W., May 2009. Annual Report on Exploration to June 2009, Retention Licence 1/2005 Hogarth Creek NW Tasmania. Mineral Holdings Australia Pty.Ltd.

Dickson, T.W., April 2010. Annual Report on Exploration to June 2010, Retention Licence 1/2005 Hogarth Creek NW Tasmania. Mineral Holdings Australia Pty.Ltd.

Duncan, D. McP., March 2004. Exploration Licence 38/2002 Dip Range, NW Tasmania. Annual Report on Exploration to March 2004. Mineral Holdings Australia Pty. Ltd.

Duncan, D. McP., Feb, 2005. Application for a retention Licence as a Flow on Title from EL 38/2002, Previously EL 43/1970, and MLS 8M/1989 and 1W/1988- Dip Range N.W. Tasmania. Mineral Holdings Australia Pty. Ltd.

Gee, R.D, 1971. Table Cape, Tasmania. Tasm. Geol. Atlas 1 Mile Series Expl. Rep., Sheet 22 (8016S).

Threader, V. M. Nov, 1989. Annual Report, EL 25/1988 (Dip Range). Mineral Holdings Australia Pty. Ltd. TCR 89-3047.

Threader, V. M. Oct, 1990. Annual Report, EL 25/1988 (Dip Range). Mineral Holdings Australia Pty. Ltd. TCR 90-3193.

Threader, V. M. Oct, 1991. Annual Report, EL 25/1988 (Dip Range). Mineral Holdings Australia Pty. Ltd. TCR 91-3307.

Threader, V. M. Oct, 1992. Annual Report for 1991-2, EL 24/1988 (Champion Road) and EL 25/1988 (Dip Range). Mineral Holdings Australia Pty. Ltd. TCR 92-3395.

Threader, V. M. Oct, 1994. Annual Report for 1993-1994, EL 25/1988 (Dip Range). Mineral Holdings Australia Pty. Ltd.


Threader, V. M. Aug, 1995. Annual Report for 1994-1995, EL 11/1992 (Muenna) and EL 20/1993 (Hebe River). Mineral Holdings Australia Pty. Ltd. TCR 95-3765.

Threader, V. M. June, 1996. Relinquishment Report. EL 25/1988 Dip Range (Part). Mineral Holdings Australia Pty. Ltd. TCR 96-3879


Turner, N.J., 1989. in Geology and Mineral Resources of Tasmania. Special Publication Geological Society of Australia 15. Eds. Burret, C.F., Martin, E. L.

7.0 KEYWORDS


Dip Range, Thomas Mountain, Detention Subgroup, Rocky Cape Group, Sand, Quartzite, Silica Resources.



Location diagram RL 1/2005



PLAN 1 Location diagram RL 1/2005




APPENDIX 1

Stim Labs Frac sand report

**API RP-56 "Recommended Practices for Testing Sand
Used in Hydraulic Fracturing Operations" Evaluations on
16/30, 20/40, and 40/70 Sand Samples From Composite,
Labeled Thomas Mountain Sand, for Mineral Holdings
Australia PTY Limited, Submitted 12/22/2010**

PREPARED FOR:
Mr. Neil M. Thomas
Mineral Holdings Australia PTY Limited
11 Kent Court
Toorak, Victoria Australia 3142
Phone: 613-9822-0077
Fax: 613-9824-7617

PREPARED BY:
STIM-LAB, INC.
7406 NORTH HWY 81
DUNCAN, OKLAHOMA 73533-1644



Lisa O'Connell, Laboratory Supervisor

P.O. NUMBER: VISA 2522

FILE NUMBER: SL9176

FEBRUARY 2011

ALL INTERPRETATIONS ARE OPINIONS BASED ON INFERENCES FROM SAMPLES AND LOGS, WHICH WERE SUPPLIED. WE CANNOT, AND DO NOT, GUARANTEE THE ACCURACY OR CORRECTNESS OF ANY INTERPRETATIONS, AND WE SHALL NOT, EXCEPT IN THE CASE OF GROSS OR WILLFUL NEGLIGENCE ON OUR PART, BE LIABLE OR RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY LOSS, COSTS, DAMAGES OR EXPENSES INCURRED OR SUSTAINED BY ANYONE RESULTING FROM ANY INTERPRETATION MADE BY ANY OF OUR OFFICERS, AGENTS OR EMPLOYEES. THESE INTERPRETATIONS ARE ALSO SUBJECT TO OUR GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS AS SET OUT IN OUR CURRENT PRICE SCHEDULE. **Notice:** Samples submitted to Stim-Lab, Inc. for use in testing services are subject to disposal or storage fees following the completion of the testing services. Directive as to the disposition of samples must be submitted in writing with the samples or otherwise provided during the course of the project. Stim-Lab, Inc. reserves the right to request that you pickup samples, whether formation material, chemicals supplied, fixtures or other materials relating to a project. You may be charged a reasonable shipping and packaging fee for return of samples for which pickup arrangements have not been made. Stim-Lab, Inc. expressly disclaims liability for intentional disposal or unintentional loss of submitted samples for which no written directive has been provided.





STIM-LAB, Inc.
7406 North HWY 81
Duncan, Oklahoma 73533
Phone: 580-252-4309
Fax: 580-252-6979
www.stimlab.com

February 1, 2011

Mr. Neil M. Thomas
Mineral Holdings Australia PTY Limited
11 Kent Court
Toorak, Victoria, Australia 3142

Dear Mr. Thomas:

STIM-LAB, Inc. has completed the API RP-56 evaluations requested on the submitted composite sand sample labeled Thomas Mountain Sand. The sample was received at Stim-Lab Inc. on 12/22/2010. Following arrival the sample was washed and sized into 16/30, 20/40, and 40/70 sized samples. API RP56 testing was then conducted each of the sized samples. Tables 1 and 2 provide the sieve analysis of the sand samples.

The crush, sphericity and roundness (Krumbein Shape Factor), turbidity, and acid solubility results are provided in Tables 3-5 for the samples. Following Table 5 are pictures of the samples. The procedures followed are as stated in API RP-56.

Thank you for having STIM-LAB perform these analyses. We hope you will consider us for your future testing needs. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

Lisa O'Connell
Laboratory Supervisor
Conductivity Laboratory



Table 1

Sieve Analysis of Submitted Proppant Samples
Submitted By: Mineral Holdings Australia PTY Limited
API RP56 Section 4, "Recommended Frac Sand Sieve Analysis"

Sample I.D.	16/30 Frac Sand Sample From Composite Labeled: Thomas Mountain Sand		20/40 Frac Sand Sample From Composite Labeled: Thomas Mountain Sand	
	Weight %		Weight %	
US Standard Sieve No.	Retained	Cumulative	Retained	Cumulative
6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
12	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
16	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
18	1.4	1.4	0.0	0.0
20	6.2	7.7	0.0	0.1
25	20.9	28.6	5.4	5.4
30	68.1	96.7	17.7	23.1
35	3.2	100.0	33.5	56.6
40	0.0	100.0	42.4	99.0
45	0.0	100.0	1.0	100.0
50	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
60	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
70	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
80	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
100	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
120	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
140	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
170	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
200	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
230	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
pan	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
total	100.0		100.0	
in-size	96.7	= as 16/30	98.9	= as 20/40
ISO Mean Dia. (mm)	0.701		0.542	
Median Dia. (mm)	0.693		0.533	

February 2011



SL 9176

Table 2

**Sieve Analysis of Submitted Proppant Sample
Submitted By: Mineral Holdings Australia PTY Limited
API RP56 Section 4, "Recommended Frac Sand Sieve Analysis"**

Sample I.D. US Standard Sieve No.	40/70 Frac Sand Sample From Composite Labeled: Thomas Mountain Sand	
	Weight %	
	Retained	Cumulative
6	0.0	0.0
8	0.0	0.0
10	0.0	0.0
12	0.0	0.0
14	0.0	0.0
16	0.0	0.0
18	0.0	0.0
20	0.0	0.0
25	0.0	0.0
30	0.0	0.0
35	0.0	0.0
40	0.4	0.4
45	33.1	33.5
50	28.6	62.1
60	21.9	84.0
70	15.8	99.7
80	0.2	100.0
100	0.0	100.0
120	0.0	100.0
140	0.0	100.0
170	0.0	100.0
200	0.0	100.0
230	0.0	100.0
pan	0.0	100.0
total	100.0	
in-size	99.4	= as 40/70
Median Dia. (mm)	0.315	

February 2011



Table 3

16/30 Frac Sand Sample From Composite Labeled: Thomas Mountain Sand
Submitted By: Mineral Holdings Australia PTY Limited
Arrived:12/22/2010

**Recommended Practices for Testing Sand
 Used In Hydraulic Fracturing Operations**

API RP56, Section 5, "Frac Sand Sphericity and Roundness"

* mean of a 20 count

<u>Sphericity</u> =	0.8
<u>Roundness</u> =	0.7
<u>Clusters</u> =	None Observed in Field of Count

Recommended Sphericity and Roundness for proppants = 0.6 or greater (API RP56)

API RP56, Section 6, "Evaluation of Sand Solubility in Acid"

* mean of 3 analysis

<u>Acid Sol. Percent</u> =	0.6	%
----------------------------	------------	----------

Recommended Maximum Acid Solubility for proppants 6/12 to 30/50 = 2.0%

API RP56, Section 7, "Recommended Silt Test"

8 FTU

Method 1: Turbidity, suggested maximum frac sand turbidity = equal or less than 250 FTU per API RP-56 and 58

API RP56, Section 8, "Recommended Frac Sand Crush-Resistance Test"

<u>Stresses Tested (psi)</u>	<u>% Fines -16+30 crush prep</u>
3000	8.7

Suggested maximum fines for 16/30 Frac Sand per API RP-56 = 14% @ 3000psi

February 2011




Table 4

20/40 Frac Sand Sample From Composite Labeled: Thomas Mountain Sand
 Submitted By: Mineral Holdings Australia PTY Limited
 Arrived: 12/22/2010

Recommended Practices for Testing Sand
 Used In Hydraulic Fracturing Operations

API RP56, Section 5, "Frac Sand Sphericity and Roundness"

* mean of a 20 count

Sphericity = 0.8
Roundness = 0.7
Clusters = Approx. 1 of Every 100 Grains Contains Clusters

Recommended Sphericity and Roundness for proppants = 0.6 or greater (ISO/DIS 13503-2/Amd. 1/API RP18C)

API RP56, Section 6, "Evaluation of Sand Solubility in Acid"

* mean of 3 analysis

Acid Sol. Percent = 0.7 %

Recommended Maximum Acid Solubility for proppants 6/12 to 30/50 = 2.0%

API RP56, Section 7, "Recommended Silt Test"

22 FTU

Method 1: Turbidity, suggested maximum frac sand turbidity = equal or less than 250 FTU per API RP-56 and 58

API RP56, Section 8, "Recommended Frac Sand Crush-Resistance Test"

<u>Stresses Tested (psi)</u>	<u>% Fines</u> <u>-20+40 crush prep</u>
4000	12.5

Suggested maximum fines for 20/40 Frac Sand per API RP-56 = 14% @ 4000psi

February 2011




Table 5

40/70 Frac Sand Sample From Composite Labeled: Thomas Mountain Sand
 Submitted By: Mineral Holdings Australia PTY Limited
 Arrived:12/22/2010

Recommended Practices for Testing Sand
 Used In Hydraulic Fracturing Operations

API RP56, Section 5, "Frac Sand Sphericity and Roundness"

* mean of a 20 count

Sphericity = 0.7
Roundness = 0.6
Clusters = Approx. 1 of Every 100 Grains Contains Clusters

Recommended Sphericity and Roundness for proppants = 0.6 or greater (ISO/DIS 13503-2/Amend.1/API RP19C)

API RP56, Section 6, "Evaluation of Sand Solubility in Acid"

* mean of 3 analysis

Acid Sol. Percent = 1.1 %

Recommended Maximum Acid Solubility for proppants 40/70 to 70/140 = 3.0%

API RP56, Section 7, "Recommended Silt Test"

13 FTU


Method 1: Turbidity, suggested maximum frac sand turbidity = equal or less than 250 FTU per API RP-56 and 58

API RP56, Section 8, "Recommended Frac Sand Crush-Resistance Test"

<u>Stresses Tested (psi)</u>	<u>% Fines</u> <u>-40+70 crush prep</u>
5000	5.2


Suggested maximum fines for 40/70 Frac Sand per API RP-56 = 8% @ 5000psi

February 2011



APPENDIX 2.

BURNIE LAB SIZE REPORT



Burnie RESEARCH LABORATORY

A Division of AMMTEC Ltd ARN: 40 396 637 856

Hydrometallurgy Consultants & Flotation Technology Specialists

49 River Road, Burnie, TAS 7320 PO Box 952, Burnie, TAS 7320 Phn: 61 3 6431 6333 Fax: 61 3 6431 6896

RECEIVED - 9 FEB 2011

Facsimile

To: Neil Thomas Fax no: 03 98247617

From: John Glen Date: _____

cc: _____ Pages: _____


Re: SA1

All pages of this facsimile are intended for the named addressee(s), are confidential and may contain legally privileged information. The copying or distribution of any of these pages or the information contained therein, by anyone other than the addressee, is prohibited. If you received this document in error, please advise us by telephone then destroy the document.


Burns RESEARCH LABORATORY
GENERAL SIZING REPORT SHEET

PROJECT	T0613
SAMPLE	P41
TEST NO	
DATE	5/02/2011
TECHNICIAN	DK

SAMPLE SIZED Pit 1	MESH NO	SIZE um	WEIGHTS			P80 um
			gm	(%)	% Pass	
	18	1180	0.10	0.07	99.9	530
	20	850	1.33	0.92	99.0	
	30	500	13.15	9.14	89.9	
	40	425	35.28	24.51	65.4	
	50	300	38.84	26.98	38.4	
	70	212	24.15	16.78	21.8	
	140	106	0.00	0.00	21.6	
		75	0.00	0.00	21.6	
		53	0.00	0.00	21.6	
		38	0.00	0.00	21.6	
CYCLOSIZER	CS1	35	0.00	0.00	21.6	
FLOW	185	CS2	28	0.00	0.00	21.6
TEMP	21	CS3	19	0.00	0.00	21.6
SG	2.75	CS4	13	0.00	0.00	21.6
MINS	20	CS5	8	0.00	0.00	21.6
CENTRIFUGE	0	4	0.00	0.00	21.6	
SUB			31.09	21.6	0.0	
TOTAL			143.94	100.00		



SAMPLE SIZED Pit 1	MESH NO	SIZE um	WEIGHTS			P80 um
			gm	(%)	% Pass	
		1180	0.04	0.02	100.0	534
		850	1.58	0.99	99.0	
		600	15.37	9.00	89.4	
		425	38.83	24.75	64.6	
		300	43.01	26.58	37.8	
		212	26.77	16.72	21.1	
		106	0.00	0.00	21.1	
		75	0.00	0.00	21.1	
		53	0.00	0.00	21.1	
		38	0.00	0.00	21.1	
CYCLOSIZER	CS1	35	0.00	0.00	21.1	
FLOW	200	CS2	28	0.00	0.00	21.1
TEMP	21	CS3	19	0.00	0.00	21.1
SG	2.75	CS4	13	0.00	0.00	21.1
MINS	18	CS5	8	0.00	0.00	21.1
CENTRIFUGE	0	4	0.00	0.00	21.1	
SUB			33.73	21.1	0.0	
TOTAL			160.13	100.00		




AVERAGE Pit 1	MESH NO	SIZE um	WEIGHTS			P80 um
			gm	(%)	% Pass	
	18	1180	0.14	0.05	100.0	532
	20	850	2.91	0.99	99.0	
	30	600	28.52	9.36	88.6	
	40	425	74.91	24.64	65.0	
	50	300	81.85	26.82	38.1	
	70	212	50.92	16.75	21.3	
	>70	<212	84.82	21.32	0.0	
TOTAL			304.07	100.00		


Burnie RESEARCH LABORATORY
GENERAL SIZING REPORT SHEET

PROJECT	T0613
SAMPLE	Pit 2 LH Side
TEST NO	
DATE	8/02/2011
TECHNICIAN	DK

SAMPLE SIZED Pit 2 LH Side	MESH NO	SIZE um	WEIGHTS			P80 um
			gm	(%)	% Pass	
	18	1180	0.79	0.40	99.6	493
	20	850	1.43	0.89	98.6	
	30	600	10.91	6.79	91.8	
	40	425	31.01	19.30	72.6	
	50	300	40.24	25.04	47.5	
	70	212	30.24	18.82	28.7	
	140	106	0.00	0.00	28.7	
		75	0.00	0.00	28.7	
		53	0.00	0.00	28.7	
		38	0.00	0.00	28.7	
CYCLOSIZER	CS1	35	0.00	0.00	28.7	
FLOW	185	CS2	28	0.00	0.00	28.7
TEMP	21	CS3	19	0.00	0.00	28.7
SG	2.75	CS4	13	0.00	0.00	28.7
MINS	20	CS5	8	0.00	0.00	28.7
CENTRIFUGE	0	4	0.00	0.00	28.7	
		SUB	48.09	28.7	0.0	
		TOTAL	160.71	100.00		



SAMPLE SIZED Pit 2 LH Side	MESH NO	SIZE um	WEIGHTS			P80 um
			gm	(%)	% Pass	
		1180	0.32	0.22	99.8	496
		850	1.13	0.77	99.0	
		600	10.75	7.33	91.7	
		425	28.81	19.85	72.0	
		300	38.70	25.03	47.0	
		212	27.75	18.93	28.1	
		106	0.00	0.00	28.1	
		75	0.00	0.00	28.1	
		53	0.00	0.00	28.1	
		38	0.00	0.00	28.1	
CYCLOSIZER	CS1	35	0.00	0.00	28.1	
FLOW	200	CS2	28	0.00	0.00	28.1
TEMP	21	CS3	19	0.00	0.00	28.1
SG	2.75	CS4	13	0.00	0.00	28.1
MINS	15	CS5	8	0.00	0.00	28.1
CENTRIFUGE	0	4	0.00	0.00	28.1	
		SUB	41.14	28.1	0.0	
		TOTAL	148.80	100.00		




AVERAGE Pit 2 LH Side	MESH NO	SIZE um	WEIGHTS			P80 um
			gm	(%)	% Pass	
	18	1180	1.11	0.36	99.8	494
	20	850	2.56	0.83	98.6	
	30	600	21.68	7.06	91.8	
	40	425	59.82	19.47	72.3	
	50	300	78.94	25.04	47.3	
	70	212	57.89	18.87	28.4	
	>70	<212	87.23	28.39	0.0	
		TOTAL	307.31	100.00		


Burnie RESEARCH LABORATORY
GENERAL SIZING REPORT SHEET

PROJECT	T0513
SAMPLE	Pt 2 RH Side
TEST NO	
DATE	8/02/2011
TECHNICIAN	DK

SAMPLE SIZED		SIZE um	WEIGHTS			P80 um
Pt 2 RH Side			gm	(%)	% Pass	
MESH NO	18	1180	0.00	0.00	100.0	613
	20	850	1.53	1.00	99.0	
	30	600	12.10	7.92	91.1	
	40	425	33.92	22.21	88.9	
	50	300	43.36	26.39	40.5	
	70	212	24.85	16.27	24.2	
	140	105	0.00	0.00	24.2	
	75	0.00	0.00	24.2		
	53	0.00	0.00	24.2		
	38	0.00	0.00	24.2		
CYCLOSIZER	CS1	38	0.00	0.00	24.2	
FLOW	185	CS2	28	0.00	0.00	24.2
TEMP	21	CS3	18	0.00	0.00	24.2
SG	2.75	CS4	13	0.00	0.00	24.2
MINS	20	CS5	8	0.00	0.00	24.2
CENTRIFUGE	0	4	0.00	0.00	24.2	
		SUB	36.99	24.2	0.0	
		TOTAL	152.75	100.00		



SAMPLE SIZED		SIZE um	WEIGHTS			P80 um
Pt 2 RH Side			gm	(%)	% Pass	
MESH NO	180	0.00	0.00	100.0	511	
	850	1.43	0.98	99.0		
	600	11.80	7.91	91.1		
	425	32.17	21.54	88.2		
	300	40.79	27.82	41.3		
	212	23.28	15.87	25.5		
	106	0.00	0.00	25.5		
	75	0.00	0.00	25.5		
	53	0.00	0.00	25.5		
	38	0.00	0.00	25.5		
CYCLOSIZER	CS1	38	0.00	0.00	25.5	
FLOW	200	CS2	28	0.00	0.00	25.5
TEMP	21	CS3	19	0.00	0.00	25.5
SG	2.75	CS4	13	0.00	0.00	25.5
MINS	15	CS5	8	0.00	0.00	25.5
CENTRIFUGE	0	4	0.00	0.00	25.5	
		SUB	37.35	25.5	0.0	
		TOTAL	146.80	100.00		



AVERAGE		SIZE um	WEIGHTS			P80 um
Pt 2 RH Side			gm	(%)	% Pass	
MESH NO	18	1180	0.00	0.00	100.0	512
	20	850	2.98	0.99	99.0	
	30	600	23.70	7.92	91.1	
	40	425	68.09	22.06	89.0	
	50	300	84.15	26.11	40.9	
	>70	<212	74.34	24.83	0.0	
		TOTAL	299.35	100.00		

