

017561

To: R. E. Thurmond
From: R. S. Adamson
Date: April 15th 1966
Subject: BEA CLAIMS

The 16 claim BEA Group as near as can be established from discussion with Dynasty personnel is not considered to be worth holding.

Apparently, the ground was staked on the basis of rumours of interesting float on the ground.

Subsequently the ground was staked and ground magnetic and geochemical surveys were carried out.

Magnetically, the claim block is split in half from east to west, with the southern half having appreciably higher magnetic response than the northern. This magnetic expression suggests a basic volcanic formation in contact with sedimentary formations; this contact striking east - west. Nothing magnetically anomalous occurs.

Geochemically, the area is more or less dead with only a few well isolated samples above background. Outcrops are apparently few or absent so that no idea of the depth to overburden is available. On this basis the ground can not be totally rejected because of geochemistry.

The area has some airborne EM response, although no ground EM follow-up has been done; However, for the most part much of the airborne EM anomalies are off the BEA ground and these are now staked by other parties.

To sum up, there is little positive reason for keeping the ground. Ground magnetic and geochemical surveys have been carried out with indifferent results. No EM surveys have been carried out on the ground. Should the ground be retained our position would be essentially defensive. It is possible, however, that the EM response could and should be followed up on the ground, in view of the relative proximity to Kerr Addison's SWIM claims. In this case, an expenditure of \$1,600 would be necessary to hold the ground in that no EM surveys can be initiated before the assessment date of May 1st.

R. S. Adamson
GEOLOGIST