



**NEWS RELEASE**

**Stock Symbol: KNA: TSX-V**

**October 3, 2012**

**Saskatoon, Saskatchewan**

**KENNA ANNOUNCES AIRBORNE GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY RESULTS ON ITS ELIZABETH LAKE PROPERTY**

Kenna Resources Corp. (“Kenna” or the “Company”) is pleased to announce the results of its airborne geophysical survey on Kenna’s wholly-owned Elizabeth Lake Property located 26 kilometres north of La Ronge, Saskatchewan. The VTEM<sup>plus</sup> and Magnetic Gradiometer airborne geophysical survey was conducted by Geotech Limited of Aurora, Ontario (“Geotech”). The property is host to the Elizabeth Lake copper, silver, gold deposit which has historical resource estimates that are not compliant with current guidelines for estimating mineral resources.

Shane Shircliff, President and CEO commented “We are very encouraged by the results of the airborne geophysical survey as it has reconfirmed the existing deposit at Elizabeth Lake and, using the same interpretative technique, identified several new targets on which to focus the next stage of our exploration efforts”.

The airborne geophysical survey utilized Geotech’s VTEM<sup>plus</sup> time domain electromagnetic (“EM”) and magnetic gradiometer system. Interpretation and modeling of the data by Geotech resulted in the discovery of strong EM anomalies, which could potentially be related to VMS deposits or structurally controlled gold-sulphide deposits. The interpretations also assist in identifying lithological units (metavolcanics, metasediments and intrusive rocks) and structures (shears and faults) in the area.

Based on the analysis four (4) target areas, A to D, were selected for Maxwell 2.5D plate modeling (Figure 1).

**Targets A1, A2 (Area A):** Target A1 (Elizabeth Lake copper, silver, gold deposit) is a sub-vertical conductor (moderately conductive), while A2 is a horizontal conductor. The depth to the top of A1 is about 53m below ground, while A2 lies some 200m below the surface, underneath a possible intrusive sill. Both targets are located near a contact and a major fault/shear zone, in an intrusive terrain. The Elizabeth Lake Cu deposit consists of two mineralized zones. The north zone was outlined as being about 20m wide with a vertical extent of about 180m and a modeled strike length of 330m. Target A1 fits the north zone descriptions.

**Target B (Area B):** Target B is a sub-vertical, long (with a modeled strike of 800m) NNW trending conductor (fairly conductive). The depth to the top of the conductor is

about 105m below ground. It is located in an intrusive terrain next to a major fault/shear zone.

**Targets C1, C2, C3, C4 and C5 (Area C):** Targets C1 and C2 are sub-vertical conductors with depths to the top about 40m below ground with modeled strike lengths of 450m and 300m respectively. Target C3 is a sub-vertical conductor with depth to the top about 20m below ground and a strike length of 375m. Targets C4 and C5 are dipping conductors, about 55° to the SE, with depths to the top between 80m to 100m below ground and modeled strike lengths of 425m and 275m respectively. All targets are located in an intrusive terrain, next to a major fault/shear zone. All of the targets in Area C are highly conductive. Three targets in this area have already had drill holes placed on or close to the newly interpreted EM anomalies. This drilling took place in 1975, following up old geophysics previously conducted in the area. Old reports describe weakly mineralized zones with some sulphides and anomalous base metal in soil samples in these areas.

**Targets D1, D2, D3, and D4 (Area D):** Targets D1 and D2 are sub-vertical conductors, with depths to the top ranging from 80m to 110m, with modeled strike lengths of 200m and 450m respectively. Targets D3 and D4 are gentle dipping conductors, with depths to the top ranging from 80m to 90m and modeled strike lengths of 150m and 175m respectively. All of the targets are located in an intrusive terrain, next to a major fault/shear zone. All of the targets in Area D are highly conductive.

A number of near North-South trending major faults or shears have been interpreted from the magnetic data. Those faults or shears could be the structural controls for potential VMS or gold-sulphide deposits. Ground prospecting and archival research is now underway on these anomalies in order to select drill targets.

Carl Verley, a Professional Geoscientist in the Province of British Columbia is the Independent Qualified Person, as defined by NI 43-101 standards, who reviewed and approved the technical content of this news release.

Kenna is engaged in the acquisition, exploration and development of mineral properties. Shares of Kenna trade on the TSX Venture Exchange under the trading symbol KNA.

For further information please contact:

Shane Shircliff		Todd L. Lahti
President and CEO	OR	CFO
306 649 0600		306 651 1930

-END-

*Neither TSX Venture Exchange nor its Regulation Services Provider (as that term is defined in the policies of the TSX Venture Exchange) accepts responsibility for the adequacy or accuracy of this release.*

### ***Caution Regarding Forward-Looking Statements***

This news release contains forward-looking statements, which address future events and conditions, which are subject to various risks and uncertainties. The Company's actual results, programs and financial position could differ materially from those anticipated in such forward-looking statements as a result of numerous factors, some of which may be beyond the Company's control. These factors include: the availability of funds; the timing and content of work programs; results of exploration activities and development of mineral properties, the interpretation of drilling results and other geological data, the uncertainties of resource and reserve estimations, receipt and security of permits and mineral property titles; project cost overruns or unanticipated costs and expenses, fluctuations in commodity product prices; currency fluctuations; and general market and industry conditions. Forward-looking statements are based on the expectations and opinions of the Company's management on the date the statements are made. The assumptions used in the preparation of such statements, although considered reasonable at the time of preparation, may prove to be imprecise and, as such, undue reliance should not be placed on forward-looking statements.

**Figure 1: Structural and Maxwell model Interpretations**

