GARCIA CONSULTANTS

12303 Galice Rd. Merlin, Oregon 97532 (503) 474-2717

October 16, 1984

Bob Schillinger
BOVIC INC.
P.O. Box 1509
Grants Pass, Oregon 97526

Bob:

Enclosed is the report on the Old Chinaman and Better Yet group of claims. Unfortunately, sample results were lower than those taken during other work. This may partly be due to the assaying method and assayer and partly due to the particle effect on gold sampling. The particle effect occurs when gold ore contains a few large particles of gold within predominately barren rock. The absence or presence of one of these particles in the sample would greatly effect the assay results. This may explain the failure of the recent sampling to show gold in areas which showed gold earlier. However, the rock fabric and the fine-grained sulfide mineralization at the Old Chinaman discovery point would make this highly unlikely. Another factor in the variance of values may be the Assayer and assaying method. Fire assaying is more accurate than atomic absorption (AA) analysis if there is an appreciable quantity of gold in the sample. Samples sent out for gold analysis by atomic absorption are usually reconnaissance samples where sensitivity and not necessarily accuracy is needed. Spectrographic Analysis are generally inaccurate for both small and large amounts of gold. Some labs use new methods which are reputed to find gold that fire assaying will miss. However, in my experience it seems that people who have producing gold mines have samples sent to reputable labs such as Hunter Labs and people who do not feel that fire assays are dependable do not have producing gold mines and are usually trying to sell a mining property. I believe that the recent sampling represents what is on the ground.

Yours truly,

Geoffrey Garcia