



Locatable Minerals Site Inspection
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Royal Gorge Field Office



| | |
|--|--|
| Date:8/22/2016 Time:10:20-10:40 a.m. Weather: Partly cloudy Inspection Purpose: Annual inspection | Project Name: Destiny Mine Case Number: COC-73930 Operator:Astemborski Location:Fairplay, CO |
| Attendees BLM: William Jenkins, Kelsey Zabrusky Operator(s): Other(s): | Project Status:Active Project Type:PoO for gold place, sand, and gravel Occupancy: Concurrent |
| General Compliance Compliance with the filed Plan of Operations, and 43 CFR 3809 (in particular the performance standards outlined in 3809.420). | <p>In general, the operation is in compliance with the Plan on file with BLM.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 40px; width: 100%;"></div> <p>In general, the operation and disturbances on site coincide with the method of prospecting, mining, and access described in the Plan of Operations.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 30px; width: 100%;"></div> |

SITE MANAGEMENT

| | |
|---|---|
| <u>Site Conditions</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Housekeeping <input type="checkbox"/> Access (clear, bermed, signed, accurate with Plan?) <input type="checkbox"/> Acreage (disturbance per plan? site secured per plan?) | <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;">Site has some glass and ceramic debris on surface, not associated with PoO activity. Access from gate on south side is clear, not signed. Little to no disturbance seen</div> |
| <u>Claim Markers</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Claim Signs <input type="checkbox"/> Corners <input type="checkbox"/> Discovery Post | <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> N/A No claim signs or corners seen. DRMS sign present in previous inspections was missing. Several green t-bar posts on northeast side of claim appeared to have flags and may have been marking utilities.</div> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p align="center"><u>Erosion Control</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Grading</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Vegetation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Drainage Control</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Best Management Practices (berms, armored drainage)</p> | <p>x N/A</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> |
| <p align="center"><u>Materials Management</u></p> <p align="center"> -Topsoil -Overburden -Waste Rock -Tailings -Ore Piles -Fines </p> <p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/> Location</p> <p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/> Best Management Practices</p> <p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/> Containment/Lining (as applicable)</p> <p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/> Stability (angle of repose, size of material)</p> | <p>x N/A</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;">No piles, tailings seen. Topsoil in place</div> |
| <p align="center"><u>Container/Tank Management</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Substance</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Storage Container/Tank (overall condition, tank capacity, secondary containment)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Spill Contingency (fixed in a timely manner? Or controlled to prevent hazardous conditions?)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Substance appropriately labeled? (NFPA, SDS accessible)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Best Management Practices</p> | <p>x N/A</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;">No containers seen on site</div> |
| <p align="center"><u>Weed Management</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Weed Control Plan</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Control Methods</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Type & Percent Surface Cover</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Best Management Practices</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;">Sagebrush and wildflower cover, looked mostly native</div> |
| <p align="center"><u>Highwall/Working Face Conditions</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Working <input type="checkbox"/> Reclaimed</p> <p>-Ravelling or rock fall present</p> <p>-Tension cracks</p> <p>-Benches (are they clean?)</p> <p>-Adequate ingress/egress</p> <p>-Measurements (concurrent with ops - height, depth, slope)</p> | <p>x N/A</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div> |
| <p align="center"><u>General Safety Conditions</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Temporary Fencing</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Flagging</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Signage (mine site, direction of travel, etc.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Does it appear that the mining is conducted in a</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;">One small, fairly shallow pit seen with no flagging or fencing</div> |

manner that will minimize highwall, material, and bank instability?

PLAN OF OPERATIONS

Operations

- ☐ Location
- ☐ Does their Plan include an occupancy? (location of temporary/permanent structures)
- ☐ Any observed impacts outside of Plan?

No active operations observed. PoO states tool shed, temporary office, trash dumpster, and fuel storage tank will be on site during operations. None of these present at time of inspection.

Operating Practices

- ☐ Mining Methods (Surface or Underground)
- ☐ Equipment (types, concurrent with Plan, good working condition)
- ☐ Surface Disturbances (size, and removed quantity)
- ☐ Processed Material Management (location, berms, HPDE lining)

No equipment or surface disturbance seen

Quality Assurance/Monitoring

- ☐ Reporting Procedures
- ☐ Systematic Monitoring (frequency, sampling procedures, adverse results response, monitoring programs - air, water, revegetation, stability, noise, etc.)

x N/A

Drilling

- ☐ Method (Air, Fluid)
- ☐ Drill Pads (location)
- ☐ Mud Pits (location, containment)
- ☐ Drill Hole Plugging and Re-Contour

x N/A

Underground Operations

- ☐ Groundwater (Is there water coming from the adit?)
- ☐ General Safety (roof stability, ventilation, cribbing condition, monitoring practices, etc.)
- ☐ Dimensions (Have the adits, shafts, trenches been advanced?)

x N/A

Water Management

- ☐ Mitigation Measures (dewatering/pumps, sediment containment, chemical treatment systems, storm water runoff controls)
- ☐ Ditch/Impoundment Capacity (will they contain the volume generated by a 100 year 24 -hour rain event?)
- ☐ Impoundment Structures (Water, tailings ponds, etc.)
- adequate freeboard - dimensions, stability - leaking at

x N/A

| | |
|---|--|
| base? | |
| <p align="center">Ore Processing</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Non-Chemical Processing (crushing, screening, washing) - methods, equipment condition, water source</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Chemical Processing (leaching, milling) - methods, chemicals involved (Xanthates, Cyanide, etc.), spill contingency</p> | <p>x N/A</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 25px; width: 350px; margin-top: 5px;"></div> |
| <p>Actions to be taken by the Operator</p> <p>Operators should read this report carefully because it may require corrective action and/or response to the BLM in order to avoid consideration of possible enforcement action.</p> | <p>Operator should consider clear signage and investigate location/condition of DRMS sign</p> |
| <p align="center">General Comments</p> <p>Other observations and notes from the inspection</p> | |
| Date Inspection Shared with CDRMS: | Date Inspection Shared with Operator: |

Photo Summary



Photo 1: Partially regrown two track heading north across claim from access gate



Photo 2: T-bar post near shallow pit. No label on post.



Photo 3: Post, possibly marking utilities. Looking north towards Tristan Loop houses.



Photo 4: Taken from Tristan Loop, looking ~south. Fence seems to indicate edge of development.