



reinterpretation is as follows: L1 has similar characteristics to F10, and they have identical depths for a vertical dyke model (9m) and the conductances are not too dissimilar (4 and 8 mhos; both at the low end of the range). Further, the existence of L2 is doubtful (unlike most of the other manually picked possible anomalies). It was also stated under ZONE F that F9 was probably further to the west than indicated. For these reasons, it is likely that L1 and F10 are part of one zone with K2 a possible northern extension. Zone L would then still be one of a series of parallel, relatively closely spaced zones, none of which have any magnetic response and where most of the defining anomalies have low grades.

ANOMALY 6: grade X. This anomaly is more than 300m from the E.L.'s eastern boundary and has not been evaluated.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The survey has defined a number of zones which strike approximately NNE. This direction has been noted as a prominent fault direction by Blissett (1962) and the weak amplitudes and ratios for many of the responses suggest a fault or shear as a likely cause. Some of these zones (e.g. A, F) have one or two good responses indicating better conductors. Such anomalies may be due to massive sulphides (within the fault), but they are also typical of anomalous zones over graphitic shales, where the conductance and interpreted depth may vary considerably because of variations in graphite content both along strike and down dip. The lack of an associated magnetic response with any of the EM anomalies suggests that there are no Renison style (pyrrhotite replacement) deposits. But base metal sulphides are presumably also legitimate targets in the area as would be cassiterite/stannite in association with pyrite (such as occurs elsewhere in the Zeehan Field, e.g. the Stormsdown mine, Queen Hill (Blissett, 1962)).

Better responses from long weakly conductive zones include A1 and A2, F1 and F2 (F3 has a large response but is over a poor conductor), and J5. More isolated 'better' responses include '4', D1 and D2 and C2. A list of anomalies for follow up in order of decreasing priority down the page is given at the end of this section.

It is recommended that the VLF technique be used as a first pass method for locating the anomalies on the ground. Magnetics are also recommended since the better resolution and accuracy obtainable from a ground survey may show relationships not apparent in the Dighem survey.

The anomalies I consider worthy of follow up are listed below: they are in three groupings in decreasing order of merit, these groupings are purely relative within this report: for example, the 'primary' group are all of poorer potential than anomaly 1 which lies outside of the E.L..

Primary:

A2, A1

4

J5

F2, F1, F3

D2, D1