

Decision Record

Golden Summit Project – East Half, Plan of Operations, FF095122

Freegold Recovery Inc. USA has submitted a Plan of Operations (POO) for hardrock mineral exploration on the Christina – Hi Yu exploration block on the eastern half of their Golden Summit project to outline a mineral resource within the Cleary Hill exploration block. Significant exploration work has already been completed on Federal and Patented claims, however; additional exploration drilling will be required to reach this goal. Proposed activities include 10,000 meters of diamond core drilling from 50 to 95 drill pads with multiple holes drilled from each pad. This work consists of an additional 6 acres of proposed drill pads and 3.5 acre of access roads on unpatented Federal claims

The proposed action was posted and made available on the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Land Use Planning and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Register.

Decision:

It is my decision to authorize the Golden Summit Project Plan of Operations for hardrock mineral exploration as described in the Proposed Action of Environmental Assessment (EA) DOI-BLM-AK-F020–2013–0006–EA. The rationale for this decision and conditions of approval are listed below.

Rationale:

The environmental effects of this action were considered in DOI-BLM-AK-F020–2013–0006–EA and were found to have no significant impacts, thus an environmental impact statement is not required.

1. The proposed action is consistent with the use of public lands under the authority of Section 302 of the Federal Land Policy Management Act and the regulations found in 43 CFR 3809.
2. The proposed action would not impact salmon or habitat known to support salmon and therefore, the proposed action was assigned the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) Determination: No effect, and no further EFH consultation is required.
3. There is potential for impacts to cultural resources by the proposed action. An "Assessment of Archaeological and Historic Resources" has been completed for this project, and appropriate mitigation measures will be put in place.

4. The evaluation and finding done to comply with Section 810 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act found no significant restrictions to subsistence use.

5. Conditions of approval to prevent the unnecessary or undue degradation of public lands can be found below (Attachment 1) and focus specifically on the following: 1) preventing and monitoring the introduction of nonnative species; 2) preventing impacts to cultural resources, and 3) prevention of impacts to vegetative resources.

Appeal Provisions:

This decision may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals (Board), Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 CFR, Part 4 and the enclosed Form 1842-1. If an appeal is taken, the notice of appeal must be filed in this office (at the above address) within 30 days from receipt of this decision. Appeals from administrative decisions issued by BLM-Alaska must be filed in writing in the office of the deciding official, either by mail or hand delivery. Notices of appeal transmitted by electronic means, such as facsimile or email will not be accepted as timely filed. The appellant has the burden of showing that the decision appealed from is in error.

/s/ Lenore Heppler _____

Manager, Eastern Interior Field Office

5/8/2013

Date

Contact Person: For additional information concerning this decision, contact Matthew Reece at the Eastern Interior Field Office, 1150 University Avenue, Fairbanks, Alaska, 99709, or by telephone at (907) 474-2334.

Attachment 1 - Conditions of Approval

Survey and Control of Invasive Plants

1) The permittee will be expected to take actions to prevent the introduction, establishment, and spread of non-native, invasive plants in the project area. The BLM will inspect reclaimed areas for the presence of non-native and invasive plants, and if found, will require the permittee to eradicate and control infestations prior to considering the reclamation complete.

While not required, the BLM **recommends** that the permittee hire an experienced botanist to complete an initial survey of the project area (focused in and immediately adjacent to previously disturbed grounds) approximately mid-way through the growing season to identify any pre-existing populations of invasive plant species and submit a copy of the findings to the BLM.

The current list of species of high and medium concern is provided below. This list could change during the period of operation, for example, if new species with high invasiveness potential are found in Alaska. Non-native species which are minimally invasive and of low concern should be minimized, but control of these species will not be required.

Eastern Interior Field Office, non-native, invasive plant species of management concern

The management of non-native, invasive plants (weeds) on BLM-managed lands in Alaska focuses on:

- 1) Prevention of introduction and spread,
- 2) Eradication through early detection of infestations and rapid response of treatments, and
- 2) Control and containment of infestations too large to eradicate.

Following is a list of weed species of medium and high concern to BLM and other land managers in Alaska. As a permittee on BLM lands, you will be responsible for the detection and control of these plants. All of these plants have been found as accidentally or intentionally introduced in Alaska. Most of them occur in Interior Alaska now (*).

Medium and High Concern

Spotted knapweed* *Centaurea stoebe* L.
Canada thistle* *Cirsium arvense* (L.) Scop.
Oxeye daisy* *Leucanthemum vulgare* Lam.
Perennial sowthistle* *Sonchus arvensis* L.
Common Tansy* *Tanacetum vulgare* L.
White sweetclover* *Melilotus alba*
Bird vetch* *Vicia cracca* L. ssp. *cracca*
Yellow toadflax* *Linaria vulgaris* P. Mill.
Orange hawkweed *Hieracium aurantiacum* L.
Scentless False Mayweed* *Tripleurospermum inodorum* (L.) Sch. Bip.
Narrowleaf hawksbeard* *Crepis tectorum* L.

Ornamental jewelweed *Impatiens glandulifera* Royle
Purple loosestrife *Lythrum salicaria* L.
Cheatgrass, *Bromus tectorum* L.
Quackgrass, *Elymus repens* (L.) Gould
Reed Canarygrass, *Phalaris arundinacea* L.

This list is nonnative plants that are of lower concern and currently do not need to be actively controlled.

Lower Concern

Common dandelion, *Taraxacum officinale* F.H. Wigg. Ssp. *officinale*
Common plantain, *Plantago major* L.
Prostrate knotweed, *Polygonum aviculare* L.
Shepherd's purse, *Capsella Bursa-pastoris* (L.) Medik.
Lambsquarter, *Chenopodium album* L.
Pineappleweed, disc mayweed *Matricaria discoidea* D.C.
Foxtail barley, *Hordeum jubatum* L.
Narrowleaf hawksbeard*, *Crepis tectorum*
Alsike clover, *Trifolium hybridum*
Common pepperweed, *Lepidium densifolium*
Common Chickweed, *Stellaria media* (L.) Vill.

Cultural Resources

1) All archaeological features and sites in the project area on undisturbed ground on unpatented federal mining claims must be avoided by the proposed drilling operations. It is recommend that the applicant hire a qualified private consultant cultural resource management (CRM) firm to either (1) locate and flag the features and sites that are present in the precise areas that Freegold Ventures wishes to work, or else to (2) evaluate the features through the regular Section 106 process, in consultation with appropriate land managers and the State Historic Preservation Office. Thereby, significant features will be avoided by the drilling crews. If Freegold Ventures feels that they must impact any of these features or sites that are agreed by the concurring parties are culturally significant, then we will need to move on to the next phase of the Section 106 cultural resource consultation process, involving Determinations of Eligibility on those impacted features, defining a list of historic properties affected by the undertaking, and, if necessary, agreeing upon any desired mitigative measures to address those adverse impacts. If necessary, a qualified private consultant CRM firm would also be able to perform this duty in a timely manner for the applicant.

2) The Area of Potential Effect for the proposed undertaking must be evaluated for prehistoric archaeological site potential. This usually involves a predictive modeling exercise to locate specific types of landforms that hold greater potential for prehistoric sites, which can then be ground proofed through subsurface testing. As above, Freegold can hire a qualified CRM firm to perform this duty in the exact areas that they wish to drill.

3) The creation of a Programmatic Agreement (PA), while not absolutely necessary, is highly desirable in order to formalize the cultural resource review process in the project area. This is prompted by the large size of the area of potential effect, and the necessity of the applicant hiring a private cultural resource consultant. If the involved parties determine that a PA is not advisable, then another agreed upon process that protects cultural resources, and which follows the Section 106 process as outlined in appropriate federal regulations, will be followed.

Vegetation Resources

1) To promote and protect the revegetation of newly disturbed sites, trails and pads shall be recontoured to approximate original grades and sufficient trees and brush will be scattered about in order to discourage future use by motor vehicles.