



April 25, 2001

**M E M O R A N D U M**

**TO:** Ron Sumanik

**FROM:** Jesse Duke, Mining Facilitator F - 1

**DATE:** Wednesday, April 25, 2001

**SUBJECT:** Excluding mining claims from the proposed Asi Keyi park

---

Further to our discussions, attached are some options for excluding the mineral claims from the proposed park for consideration. We understand there is some urgency to completing this claim, and wished to find a solution to this matter that would not complicate your negotiations. We are recommending Option A with this objective in mind. Essentially it carves out the area around the existing claims from the park in a manner that makes some geographic sense. This option, if accepted, would be acceptable to the claim holder.

The other options require more work, and would, I understand, probably be workable only if they could be completed as part of the implementation of claim. We would be pleased to discuss the matter more fully.

It would also be useful to receive the views of Renewable Resources, and they may also have some useful suggestions on this matter.

Cc: Don Hutton, Director, Policy and Planning, Renewable Resources  
Janet Moodie, ADM, Strategic Management, Economic Development

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Jesse Duke", written in a cursive style.

## Options for excluding Archer Cathro's claim blocks from Asi Keyi Natural Environment Park

### Background

The 2,996 km<sup>2</sup> Asi Keyi Natural Environment Park SMA was interim protected in November 2000, as an agreement between YTG, Federal Government, and the Kluane & White River First Nations. In addition to Asi Keyi SMA, Kluane First Nation has an approximately 13,000 km<sup>2</sup> Proposed Kluane National Park Reserve SMA, and a 57 km<sup>2</sup> Proposed Pickhandle Lakes Habitat Protection Area SMA.

A desk-top geological compilation delineating areas considered to have highest mineral potential was produced in 1996 to help define the boundaries of a proposed SMA within Kluane Wildlife Sanctuary, but no detailed mineral assessment was done for boundary definition of Asi Keyi Natural Environment Park.

Asi Keyi SMA boundaries truncate two claim blocks owned by Archer Cathro & Associates. The Archer Cathro claims were staked in July, 1994. The company staked additional contiguous claims in February 2000, when the proposed SMA was not public knowledge. Yukon Government and Kluane First Nation agreed to explore ways to exclude the Archer Cathro claims from Asi Keyi SMA. YTG Economic Development identified three options and recommends Option A for excluding the mineral claims from the Natural Environment Park:

### Option A: Exclude the mineral claims and a geographic buffer – Recommended Option

#### Pros

- Results in excluding approximately 60 to 80 km<sup>2</sup> from the proposed SMA, which represents 2% to 2.7% of Asi Keyi SMA, or 0.4% to 0.5% of Kluane FN's total SMA area
- Proposed adjusted boundaries are based on topographic features, therefore facilitating surveys and field identification
- Satisfies Archer Cathro & Associates request for a buffer around their claims
- Satisfies Economic Development's goal of not incorporating further high mineral potential areas into the SMA
- Consistent with Economic Development's intent to exclude all existing mineral claims from SMA boundaries
- Accounts for the uncertainty of mineral claim posts locations
- Does not require the additional expenses of performing a detailed mineral assessment

#### Cons

- Does not utilize incremental information and improved resolution from a detailed mineral assessment

### Option B: Perform a detailed mineral resource assessment of the Asi Keyi SMA

- Assumes that maintaining Asi Keyi SMA land base is essential to proceed with Land Claims agreement
- The desktop geological compilation indicates that all lands surrounding and immediately within the SMA boundaries in the north and east are considered of very high mineral potential

#### Pros

- A detailed mineral potential map designed for boundary definition would provide better resolution than the desktop compilation
- Highest mineral potential lands in the SMA could be given habitat protection area designation, or
- Lowest mineral potential areas identified outside the SMA could be exchanged for the claims and buffer
- Satisfies Economic Development's goal of not incorporating further high mineral potential areas into the SMA
- Different designations of protection would give the First Nations greater economic opportunities without compromising their ability to manage the land base

#### Cons

- The Land Claims negotiator indicated that he does not support changing designation
- Uncertainty that management plans under other designations of protection will allow mineral activity
- Cost and allocation of resources to perform a detailed mineral assessment

### Option C: Exchange the mineral claims and buffer for equivalent land base elsewhere without detailed mineral assessment

- Assumes that maintaining Asi Keyi SMA land base is essential to proceed with Land Claims agreement

#### Pros

- Does not require the additional expenses of performing a detailed mineral assessment








#### Cons



- Requires incorporating areas considered to be of very high mineral potential to the north of the SMA boundary, or
- Requires incorporating an area of lower mineral potential to the northwest of the SMA, which drains existing mineral claims and mineral occurrences
- Does not satisfy Economic Development's goal of not incorporating further high mineral potential areas into the SMA
- The exchange would involve a further loss of high mineral potential ground, or compromise other mineral properties in order to accommodate one company's claims
- Does not utilize incremental information and improved resolution from a detailed mineral assessment

Economic Development recommends Option A: Exclude the mineral claims and a geographic buffer

**Proposed Asi Keyi SMA Natural Environment Park  
and 2 km buffer around Archer, Cathro & Associates' mineral claims**




**LEGEND**

-  Mineral Claims
-  Kluane and White River FN Traditional Territory
-  Kluane Wildlife Sanctuary
-  Proposed Asi Keyi SMA Natural Environment Park
-  Proposed Kluane National Park Reserve SMA
-  Kluane National Park
-  Proposed Habitat Protection Area SMA



Preferred Option: Excluding the claims and a geographic buffer

- Asi Keyi SMA boundary
- Mineral claims (November 2000)
- Topography based buffer around Archer Cathro claims (Option A)



## Options for excluding Archer Cathro's claim blocks from Asi Keyi Natural Environment Park

### Background

The 2,996 km<sup>2</sup> Asi Keyi Natural Environment Park SMA was interim protected in November 2000, as an agreement between YTG, Federal Government, and the Kluane & White River First Nations. In addition to Asi Keyi SMA, Kluane First Nation has a 12,997 km<sup>2</sup> Proposed Kluane National Park Reserve SMA, and a 57 km<sup>2</sup> Proposed Pickhandle Lakes Habitat Protection Area SMA.

A desk-top geological compilation delineating areas considered to have highest mineral potential was produced in 1996 to help define the boundaries of a proposed SMA within Kluane Wildlife Sanctuary, but no detailed mineral assessment was done for boundary definition of Asi Keyi Natural Environment Park.

Asi Keyi SMA boundaries truncate two claim blocks owned by Archer Cathro & Associates. The Archer Cathro claims were staked in July, 1994. The company staked additional contiguous claims in February 2000, when the proposed SMA was not public knowledge. Yukon Government and Kluane First Nation agreed to explore ways to exclude the Archer Cathro claims from Asi Keyi SMA. YTG Mineral Resources Branch identified the following options for excluding the mineral claims from the Natural Environment Park:

### Option A: Perform a detailed mineral resource assessment of the Asi Keyi SMA

- All lands surrounding and immediately within the SMA boundaries in the north and east are considered of very high mineral potential unless a detailed mineral potential map shows otherwise
- Highest mineral potential lands in the SMA could be given habitat protection area designation, or
- Lowest mineral potential areas identified outside the SMA could be exchanged for the claims and buffer
- Satisfies Economic Development's goal of not incorporating further high mineral potential areas into the SMA
- The Land Claims negotiator indicated that he does not support changing designation

### Option B: Exclude the mineral claims and a geographic buffer

- Satisfies Archer Cathro & Associates request for a minimum of 2 km buffer around their claims
- Satisfies Economic Development's goal of not incorporating further high mineral potential areas into the SMA
- Consistent with Economic Development's intent to exclude all existing mineral claims from SMA boundaries
- Results in excluding approximately 60 to 80 km<sup>2</sup> from the proposed SMA, which represents 2% to 2.7% of Asi Keyi SMA, or 0.4% to 0.5% of Kluane FN's total SMA area
- Proposed adjusted boundaries are based on topographic features, therefore facilitating surveys and field identification
- Accounts for the uncertainty of mineral claim posts locations
- Does not utilize a detailed mineral assessment

### Option C: Exclude the mineral claims and a 2 km buffer

- Satisfies Archer Cathro & Associates' request for a 2 km minimum buffer around their claims
- Satisfies Economic Development's goal of not incorporating further high mineral potential areas into the SMA
- Consistent with Economic Development's intent to exclude all existing mineral claims from SMA boundaries
- Results in excluding approximately 36 km<sup>2</sup> from the proposed SMA, which represents 1.2% of Asi Keyi SMA, or 0.2% of Kluane FN's total SMA area
- Produces an SMA boundary that is difficult to identify
- Does not take into account the uncertainty of mineral claim posts locations
- Does not utilize a detailed mineral resource assessment

### Option D: Exchange the mineral claims and buffer for equivalent landbase elsewhere without detailed mineral assessment

- Lower mineral potential area to the northwest of the SMA drains existing mineral claims and mineral occurrences
- Does not satisfy Economic Development's goal of not incorporating further high mineral potential areas into the SMA
- The exchange would involve a further loss of high mineral potential ground in order to accommodate one company's claims
- satisfies YTG Land Claims' request for no net loss to the SMA
- Does not utilize a detailed mineral assessment

**Options for excluding Archer Cathro's claim blocks from Asi Keyi Natural Environment Park**

**Background**

Asi Keyi Natural Environment Park was interim protected in November 2000, as a tri-partite agreement between YTG, Federal Government, and Kluane and White River First Nations. Currently, Asi Keyi Natural Environment park is 2,996 km<sup>2</sup> or 11% of the Kluane and White River FN Traditional Territories. In addition to Asi Keyi SMA, Kluane First Nation has the ~~12,997~~ km<sup>2</sup> Kluane National Park SMA, which represents another 39% of Kluane and White River FN Traditional Territory.

A desk-top geological compilation delineating areas considered to have high mineral potential was produced in 1996 to help define the boundaries of a proposed SMA within Kluane Wildlife Sanctuary, but no mineral assessment was done for boundary definition of Asi Keyi Natural Environment Park.

Asi Keyi SMA boundaries truncate two claim blocks owned by Archer Cathro & Associates. The Archer Cathro claims were staked in July, 1994, and expanded into the park boundaries in February 2000, when the proposed SMA was not public knowledge. *with additional contiguous claims staked*

Yukon Government and Kluane First Nation agreed to explore ways to exclude the Archer Cathro claims from Asi Keyi SMA. YTG Mineral Resources Branch identified the following options for excluding the mineral claims from the Natural Environment Park:

**Option A: Excluding the mineral claims and a 2 km <sup>reasonable</sup> buffer producing minimum net loss to the SMA**

② This option satisfies Economic Development's mandate of not incorporating further high mineral potential areas into the SMA, and is consistent with the original intent to draw the SMA boundaries excluding all stakeholders' interest. (This would result in a net loss to the interim protected SMA of 36 km<sup>2</sup>, which represents 1.2% of Asi Keyi SMA, and 0.2% of Kluane FN's total SMA area.)

**Option B: Perform a detailed mineral resource assessment of the Asi Keyi SMA**

A detailed mineral potential map would help identify land quanta of lower mineral potential outside the SMA that could be exchanged by the claims and buffer, or identify areas of high mineral potential that could be given habitat protection area designation.

**Option C: Exchange the mineral claims and 2 km buffer for equivalent landbase elsewhere**

All lands surrounding and immediately within the SMA boundaries are of very high mineral potential. An exchange would involve a further loss of high mineral potential ground in order to accommodate one company's claims, but would satisfy YTG Land Claims' request for no net loss to the SMA.

*Handwritten calculations:*

Pickmole 57.04

Topo buffer 80

Total SMA 61

2996

12,997

16,050

Asi Pickmole Kluane NB

2996 — 100

36 — 2

115 G 12

115 G 5

115 F 9

## Options for excluding Archer Cathro's claim blocks from Asi Keyi Natural Environment Park

### Background

The 2,996 km<sup>2</sup> Asi Keyi Natural Environment Park SMA was interim protected in November 2000, as an agreement between YTG, Federal Government, and the Kluane & White River First Nations. In addition to Asi Keyi SMA, Kluane First Nation has a 12,997 km<sup>2</sup> Proposed Kluane National Park Reserve SMA, and a 57 km<sup>2</sup> Proposed Pickhandle Lakes Habitat Protection Area SMA.

A desk-top geological compilation delineating areas considered to have highest mineral potential was produced in 1996 to help define the boundaries of a proposed SMA within Kluane Wildlife Sanctuary, but no detailed mineral assessment was done for boundary definition of Asi Keyi Natural Environment Park.

Asi Keyi SMA boundaries truncate two claim blocks owned by Archer Cathro & Associates. The Archer Cathro claims were staked in July, 1994. The company staked additional contiguous claims in February 2000, when the proposed SMA was not public knowledge. Yukon Government and Kluane First Nation agreed to explore ways to exclude the Archer Cathro claims from Asi Keyi SMA. YTG Mineral Resources Branch identified the following options for excluding the mineral claims from the Natural Environment Park:

### Option A: Perform a detailed mineral resource assessment of the Asi Keyi SMA

- The desktop geological compilation indicates that all lands surrounding and immediately within the SMA boundaries in the north and east are considered of very high mineral potential
- A detailed mineral potential map designed for boundary definition would provide better resolution than the desktop compilation
- Highest mineral potential lands in the SMA could be given habitat protection area designation, or
- Lowest mineral potential areas identified outside the SMA could be exchanged for the claims and buffer
- Satisfies Economic Development's goal of not incorporating further high mineral potential areas into the SMA
- Different designations of protection would give the First Nations greater economic opportunities without compromising their ability to manage the land base
- The Land Claims negotiator indicated that he does not support changing designation

### Option B: Exclude the mineral claims and a geographic buffer

- Satisfies Archer Cathro & Associates' request for a minimum of 2 km buffer around their claims
- Satisfies Economic Development's goal of not incorporating further high mineral potential areas into the SMA
- Consistent with Economic Development's intent to exclude all existing mineral claims from SMA boundaries
- Results in excluding approximately 60 to 80 km<sup>2</sup> from the proposed SMA, which represents 2% to 2.7% of Asi Keyi SMA, or 0.4% to 0.5% of Kluane FN's total SMA area
- Proposed adjusted boundaries are based on topographic features, therefore facilitating surveys and field identification
- Accounts for the uncertainty of mineral claim posts locations
- Does not utilize a detailed mineral assessment

### Option C: Exclude the mineral claims and a 2 km buffer

- Satisfies Archer Cathro & Associates' request for a 2 km minimum buffer around their claims
- Satisfies Economic Development's goal of not incorporating further high mineral potential areas into the SMA
- Consistent with Economic Development's intent to exclude all existing mineral claims from SMA boundaries
- Results in excluding approximately 36 km<sup>2</sup> from the proposed SMA, which represents 1.2% of Asi Keyi SMA, or 0.2% of Kluane FN's total SMA area
- Produces an SMA boundary that is difficult to identify
- Does not take into account the uncertainty of mineral claim posts locations
- Does not utilize a detailed mineral resource assessment

### Option D: Exchange the mineral claims and buffer for equivalent landbase elsewhere without detailed mineral assessment


- All lands surrounding and immediately within the SMA boundaries in the north and east are considered of very high mineral potential unless a detailed mineral potential map shows otherwise
- Lower mineral potential area to the northwest of the SMA drains existing mineral claims and mineral occurrences
- Does not satisfy Economic Development's goal of not incorporating further high mineral potential areas into the SMA
- The exchange would involve a further loss of high mineral potential ground in order to accommodate one company's claims
- Satisfies YTG Land Claims' request for no net loss to the SMA
- Does not utilize a detailed mineral assessment



◆ Assessreps\_border.shp

▨ Mineral claims

■ Asi Keyi boundary region



## Anna.Fonseca

---

**From:** Ron.Sumanik  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 13, 2001 11:36 AM  
**To:** Jo-Anne.van Randen  
**Cc:** Jesse.Duke; Anna.Fonseca; Ella.LeGresley; Roger.Hulstein; Robert.Stroshein  
**Subject:** RE: Asi Keyi & mineral Claims

During negotiations last spring we raised the matter with both Kluane and White River FNs that we had an interest in excising the claims and perhaps an undetermined small quantity of land around them. Kluane appeared cooperative, White River seemed lost frankly even though specific land trade proposals were not tabled such as a trade for the campground. The long and the short of this is that we were confident we could achieve this objective. In any event, the entirely separate issue involving the negotiation of Kluane's specific claim on the National Park went unsatisfactorily this summer and led to discontinued talks followed by the uncertainty of who the new chief would be. We now have a new chief, we have begun contact with him and the council however they seem most interested with Minister Nault this week as a first approach.

I don't know what will come of this except to say that I think if we see this land claim going up in smoke at the March 31 deadline our interest will be to redo the Asi Keyi withdrawal with the claims cut out. I suspect Canada will have a similar view but I cannot say that for certain until we have that discussion. Our current approach is to remain hopeful that we resolve the impediments necessary to concluding a claim. Hopefully the Nault mtg. will achieve a breakthrough on the specific claim that will pave the way for conclusion of the claims and resolution of Asi Keyi. I've given up speculating and can only say that I'm as frustrated with the last two years as I've ever been.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Jo-Anne.van Randen  
**Sent:** Friday, November 09, 2001 11:18 AM  
**To:** Ron.Sumanik  
**Cc:** Jesse.Duke; Anna.Fonseca; Ella.LeGresley; Roger.Hulstein; Robert.Stroshein  
**Subject:** Asi Keyi & mineral Claims

Ron,

Ec Dev had a meeting regarding SMAs and the question of where the negotiations to adjust the boundaries away from the Don & Wolv mineral claims came up.

The last meeting Jesse & I attended with you on this matter, you mentioned that there might be other alternatives to exchanging land to exclude the mineral claims. Alternatives like a trade for a campground? on Kluane Lake, or other options that you were going to investigate.

Could you please advise where these negotiations are at as we have a responsibility to our clients who's claims became affected by the Interim Protection of the proposed Asi Keyi SMA in November 2000.

Thanks.

**Jo-Anne vanRanden**  
**Yukon Geology Program**  
**Telephone: (867) 667-8234**  
**Fax: (867) 393-6232**  
**Email: [jo-anne.vanranden@gov.yk.ca](mailto:jo-anne.vanranden@gov.yk.ca)**

**Jo-Anne.van Randen**

**From:** Ella.LeGresley  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 21, 2000 2:22 PM  
**To:** Carl.Rumscheidt; Ron.Sumanik  
**Cc:** Joe.MacGillivray; Jo-Anne.van Randen; Shirley.Abercrombie  
**Subject:** Asi Keyi (Klutlan SMA) - WRFN & KFN

Hi Carl and Ron,

For the "record", I wanted to confirm the telephone conversation I had with Carl on June 15th last week, in regards to the Archer Cathro Wolv and Don mineral claims that overlap with the Asi Keyi SMA.

Economic Development provided Ron with a map showing the overlap along with the dates of staking. I appreciate that LCIS is taking this overlap issue very seriously, wanting to find a satisfactory resolution. Ron had advised that Jim Bishop (Fed. Claims) was also keen to find a resolution and seemed most interested in the idea of asking the claim holder to withdraw their claims in the area. This option is not supported by Economic Development, and our preference is for relatively minor adjustments to the SMA boundaries.

There are several reasons for our view:

- One of the stated commitments of the new Yukon (Liberal) Government is to "respect [mineral] claims that have already been staked when new parks or protected areas are created". I of course realize that settling land claims is also a top priority of our new government, but the mineral claims commitment is a very specific intent and asking the company to withdraw their claims would surely compromise YTG's intended policy. Further, I understood that at the time the boundary was being defined, it was intended to exclude the Archer Cathro claims existing at the time. I realize that the claims were expanded subsequent to the SMA boundary agreements.
- Our new Premier just returned from Vancouver having expressed the interest in welcoming back the mineral industry to the Yukon. The option of asking a company to withdraw claims in good standing flies in the face of the welcome back message.
- While Archer Cathro voluntarily withdrew their claims in Tombstone, Economic Development thinks it is inappropriate to take advantage of this good will and approach the company to do the same in another area.

The area of overlap is relatively minor compared to the size of the SMA, and fortunately the overlap occurs on the edge of the SMA rather than a hole in the middle. I know it is difficult, and may seem impossible, to go back to the First Nation at this stage, and you will have to consider the implications of doing so. However, Ec. Dev.'s assessment of the implications of requesting movement on the claims is that this would be negatively regarded by industry, especially at this time. We all want to avoid the problems experienced with Tombstone Park.

Ec. Dev. had committed to Ron to review possible boundary adjustments to compensate for the changes to exclude the mineral claims. Jo-Anne vanRanden has completed her review and will be providing you with a memo and map. All of the north-east SMA boundary already incorporates land with high mineral potential, therefore we would not want to see adjustments in this area. The south-east corner of the SMA along the Kluane Park border would be most suitable for a slight increase. From the park boundary to a distance of about 2.5 km would be supported by Ec. Dev. (Jo-Anne's map shows the area with a gold star.) One advantage of an increase in this area from the environmental perspective, is that the topography is such that the land drains into the park at this location.

Looking forward to our further deliberations on this matter. Thanks.

Ella.

5915

P.S. to Ron: Thanks for providing a copy of the letter from the G.L. to Minister Stewart. The letter refers to an enclosed map that shows the area for which withdrawal was requested ("the yellow area outlined and stippled in green"). It sounds like the map might have been produced by Renewable Resources. Would it be possible to get a copy or have a look at this map?

**Jo-Anne.van Randen**

**From:** Ella.LeGresley  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 22, 2000 9:13 AM  
**To:** Ron.Sumanik; Carl.Rumscheidt; Lesley.McCullough  
**Cc:** Joe.MacGillivray; Jo-Anne.van Randen  
**Subject:** Asi Keyi (klutlan) SMA

Hi LCIS,

In response to Ron's invitation yesterday to a meeting to discuss potential resolutions to the SMA boundary overlap with the Archer Cathro mineral claims, we will accept the option to meet on Monday, June 26 at 4:00 p.m., LCIS boardroom. Joe MacGillivray and I will attend with representation from our Mineral Resources Branch (Jo-Anne van Randen if she's available). Thanks.

Ella.

**Jo-Anne.van Randen**

**From:** Ella.LeGresley  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 22, 2000 3:01 PM  
**To:** Joe.MacGillivray  
**Cc:** Jo-Anne.van Randen; Shirley.Abercrombie  
**Subject:** Asi Keyi (Klutlan) SMA

On my way to lunch I talked to Florian at LCIS on some Ta'an matters. While I was there I spoke to Ron Sumanik to get an idea of the proposal(s) they will be making at our Monday meeting on Asi Keyi.

Land Claims feels they have a timing problem largely due to the availability of the Kluane First Nation to be able to discuss the issue in a timely manner. Kluane is busy with hosting the CYFN General Assembly and getting ready for their own assembly. Further, LCIS needs to bring White River into the discussion and White River has already signed off a map. The thought is that if LCIS pushes the FN's to hear the case now, the results may be negative, but that given the time to fully explain the situation, there is a good chance of success in resolving the issue to the satisfaction of Ec. Dev. (i.e. exclude the claims).

In the meantime the mineral claim staking season is on, possibly creating further overlaps, meaning the problem could get larger. All the while we have an outstanding request from the Government Leader in 1997 to immediately proceed with the withdrawal, and from what LCIS has dug up, it appears the delay in proceeding can be blamed on YTG itself.

The LCIS proposal might be to proceed with the SMA withdrawal with the overlap, but with the commitment to resolve the issue with the FN's ASAP, and amend the withdrawal (boundaries) upon resolution. The thought is they would move on the SMA before and independent of the land selection withdrawals.

So what do I think? First we should probably caucus before going to the meeting Monday. We need to ask ourselves (and LCIS in the meeting) if we can trust they will succeed in resolving the overlap. I know that if a FN can't or won't be in the right frame of mind, or if certain people are not present at the discussion, it is sometimes a better strategy to wait for the right time. Sometimes pushing folks to deal with an issue when the timing is bad can serve to entrench folks into positions that are impossible to move from. (Kind of like choosing your battles and choosing the right time for your battles, or like not asking some folks for anything until they've had their morning caffeine fix!)

All for now, except I'm available for the next hour or so, then Monday morning. I have a Ta'an meeting on Monday from 1 to 3 p.m. and will plan to come back to Ec. Dev. before going to our meeting with LCIS. We could caucus at 3:30 before going across the street.

Ella.  
5915

## Asi Keyi Boundary - Exploration Assessment Reports

OTHER_NI	ASSMT_REP	ASSMT_REP	AUTHOR	COMPANY	AREA_DISTR	NTS	YEAR	INCLUDES	MICROFICHE	SURVEYS	N15	CONTENTS
19085	1592	3920	Gibbons, C. AND Hilker, R.G. AND O'	NA	Quill Creek, Arch Cr	115G/05	1967	e m profi	2 microfi	geophysic	Arch, Leg	Geophysic
91578	1593	30660	Savell, M.	Noranda Exploration	Burwash Landing	115G/05	1984		23, 2	location,	Mar 1-4	Regional/
91608	1594	30960	Savell, M.	Noranda Exploration	Burwash Creek, Quill	115G/05	1985		2	location,	CEM 1-30.	Regional/
92575	1694	36100	Davidson, G.S.	Lodestar Exploration	Donjek River & Destr	115G/05	1988	claim map	16	geochemic	Missy 1-2	Geochemis
92744	1695	37590	Davidson, G.S.	Lodestar Exploration	Donjek River	115G/05	1989	claim map	18	geophysic	Missy 1-2	Economic
92578	1762	36120	Davidson, G.S.	Harjay Exploration L	Donjek River	115G/05	1988	location	15	geophysic	SF 1-32	Geophysic
93662	1763	47850	Linda E. Chung//Dighem,CGG Canada L	Expatriate Resources	Donjek	115G/12	1997				Don 1-20,	Airborne
91433	2027	29220	Eaton, W.D.	Archer, Cathro & Ass	Donjek River	115F/09	1983		18, 1 mic	geologica	Narnia 1-	Regional
19074	2066	3830	Lloyd, J.	Eagle Geophysics Ltd	White River	115F/10	1968	i p profi	1 microfi	geophysic	Doug	Geophysic
19071	2077	3800	Walcott, R.E.	Gaylord Mines Ltd. A	White River	115F/10//	1968	i p profi	2 microfi	geophysic	Nack	Geophysic
19073	2078	3820	Walcott, P.E.	Eagle Geophysics Ltd	White River	115F/10	1968		1 microfi	geophysic	KLU	Geophysic
19072	2093	3810	Lloyd, J.	Eagle Geophysics Ltd	White River	115F/10	1968	i p profi	2 microfi	geophysic	Doug	Geophysic
61476	2094	12250	Smitheringale, W.V.	Silver City Mines Ltd	White River	115F/15	1973	drillhole	1 microfi	location,	Marc	Geophysic
61477	2095	12260	Smitheringale, W.V.	Silver City Mines Lt	White River	115F/15	1974	plans	1 microfi	location,	Marc	Regional
19891	2110	5210	Smitheringale, W.V.	Silver City Mines Lt	White River	115F/15	1972	drillhole	2 microfi	geophysic	Marc	Geophysic
19892	2111	5220	Smitheringale, W.V.	Silver City Mines Lt	White River	115F/15	1972	drillhole	3 microfi	geophysic	Marc	Geophysic
19893	2112	5230	Stevenson, W.G.	Silver City Mines Lt	White River	115F/15	1973	drillhole	1 microfi		Marc	Geophysic
60733	2113	8160	Baird, J.G.	Silver City Mines Lt	White River	115F/15	1967		1 microfi	geologica	Marc	Regional
62001	2114	13600	Sinclair, A.J.	Silver City Mines Lt	White River	115F/15	1976		2 microfi	geologica	Mark, Nuk	Regional/
91318	2115	28070	Cathro, R.J.	United Pemetex Ltd.	White River	115F/15	1968	drillhole	38, 3 mic	geochemic	White Riv	Economic
91319	2116	28080	NA	United Permatex Ltd.	White River	115F/15	1972	drillhole	6, 1 micr	location	Golden Ho	Economic
91323	2117	28120	Smitheringale, W.V.	Silver City Mines Lt	White River	115G/13//	1975	drillhole	64, 3 vol	geophysic	White Riv	Economic
60732	2118	8150	Baird, J.G.	Seigel Associates Lt	White River	115F/15	1968	i p profi	3 microfi	geophysic	KC, Marc	Geophysic
60886	2119	8630	Cathro, R.J.	Silver City Mines Lt	White River	115F/15	1967	cross-sec	2 microfi	geophysic	Marc, Sla	Geophysic
61676	2120	12990	Cathro, R.J.	Silver City Mines Lt	White River	115F/15	1966		1 microfi	geologica	Marc, Sla	Regional
61737	2121	13130	Cathro, R.J.	Silver City Mines Lt	White River	115F/15	1967		1 microfi	geologica	Marc	Regional
91317	2122	28060	Cathro, R.J.	Silver City Mines Lt	White River	115F/15	1968		11, 1 mic	location,	Marc, KC	Economic
60191	2123	6510	Renshaw, R.E.	Ronex Mines Ltd.	White River	115F/15	1969	e m profi	1 microfi	location,	Ore	Geophysic
19890	2137	5200	Cathro, R.J.	Silver City Mines Lt	White River	115F/15	1966		1 microfi	geologica	Marc	Regional/
19082	2138	3890	Cathro, R.J.	Silver City Mines Lt	White River	115F/15	1968	cross-sec	3 microfi	geophysic	Marc, Agg	Regional/
91499	2139	29870	Boyd, R.T.//Flanagan, M.	Homestake Mineral De	Boulder Creek	115F/15	1983		30, 1 mic	location,	Can 1-52	Structura
92704	2164	37280	Carlyle, L.W.	Carlyle Geological S	Moose Creek	115F/15	1988	location	15		PGMB 1-4	Economic
60190	2165	6500	Oddy, R.W.	Imperial Oil Enterpr	Kluane Lake	115F/15	1970		3 microfi	geochemic	Lep	Geochemis
60987	2166	9600	Oddy, R.W.	Imperial Oil Enterpr	White River	115F/15	1971	magnetic	2 microfi	geologica	Lep	Geophysic
19078	2184	3870	McGinn, G.J.	Imperial Oil Enterpr	White River	115F/15	1967	drillhole	2 microfi	geophysic	Lep	Geophysic
91320	2185	28090	Grant, G.W.	Canyon City Explorat	Rabbit Creek	115F/15	1970	drillhole	2, 1 micr		CC	Economic
19076	2186	3850	Baird, J.G.	Canyon City Explorat	White River	115F/15	1968	i p profi	1 microfi	geophysic	CC	Geophysic
19079	2187	3880	Cathro, R.J.	Pacific Giant Steel	Rabbit Creek, White	115F/15	1967		1 microfi	geologica	CC	Regional/