



Rock solid resources.
Proven advice.™

SEARCH MINERALS INC.

TECHNICAL REPORT ON THE FOXTROT PROJECT IN LABRADOR, NEWFOUNDLAND & LABRADOR, CANADA

NI 43-101 Report

Qualified Persons:

**R. Mohan Srivastava, P.Geo.
Jacques Gauthier, ing., MGP
Jason J. Cox, P.Eng.
Holger Krutzelmann, P.Eng.**

December 14, 2012



Report Control Form

Document Title

Technical Report on the Foxtrot Project in Labrador,
Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada

Client Name & Address

Search Minerals Inc.
1320 - 885 West Georgia Street
P.O. Box 1045
Vancouver, British Columbia V6C 3E8

Document Reference

Project #1802

Status & Issue No.

Version

0

Issue Date

December 14, 2012

Lead Author

R. Mohan Srivastava, P.Geo.
Jacques Gauthier, ing.
Jason J. Cox, P.Eng.
Holger Krutzelmann, P.Eng.

(Signed)

Peer Reviewer

Deborah A. McCombe,
P.Geo.

(Signed)

Project Manager Approval

Jason J. Cox, P.Eng.

(Signed)

Project Director Approval

Jason J. Cox, P.Eng.

(Signed)

Report Distribution

Name	No. of Copies
Client	
RPA Filing	1 (project box)

Roscoe Postle Associates Inc.

55 University Avenue, Suite 501
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2H7
Canada

Tel: +1 416 947 0907

Fax: +1 416 947 0395

mining@rpacan.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
1 SUMMARY	1-1
Executive Summary.....	1-1
Technical Summary.....	1-10
2 INTRODUCTION	2-1
3 RELIANCE ON OTHER EXPERTS.....	3-1
4 PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION	4-1
5 ACCESSIBILITY, CLIMATE, LOCAL RESOURCES, INFRASTRUCTURE AND PHYSIOGRAPHY	5-1
6 HISTORY.....	6-1
7 GEOLOGICAL SETTING AND MINERALIZATION.....	7-1
Regional Geology	7-1
Local Geology.....	7-3
Property Geology.....	7-5
Rare Earth Mineralization	7-7
8 DEPOSIT TYPES	8-1
9 EXPLORATION	9-1
Exploration Potential.....	9-5
10 DRILLING	10-1
11 SAMPLE PREPARATION, ANALYSES AND SECURITY	11-1
Quality Assurance and Quality Control.....	11-2
12 DATA VERIFICATION.....	12-1
13 MINERAL PROCESSING AND METALLURGICAL TESTING	13-1
Mineralogy Studies	13-1
Mineral Abundance.....	13-1
Grain Size Distribution.....	13-2
Mineral Chemistry.....	13-3
Liberation and Association.....	13-4
Beneficiation of Foxtrot Sample.....	13-4
Summary	13-11
Recommendations.....	13-12
14 MINERAL RESOURCE ESTIMATE	14-1
Summary	14-1
Data	14-2
Resource Estimation Procedure	14-14
Resource Classification	14-18
Checks of Resource Block Model.....	14-19

Mineral Resource Estimate.....	14-21
Sensitivity of Reporting Cut-Off	14-21
15 MINERAL RESERVE ESTIMATE	15-1
16 MINING METHODS.....	16-2
Introduction.....	16-2
Open Pit Mining	16-3
Mine Infrastructure And Services.....	16-9
17 RECOVERY METHODS	17-1
Preliminary Proposed Process	17-1
18 PROJECT INFRASTRUCTURE	18-1
19 MARKET STUDIES AND CONTRACTS	19-1
Rare Earths.....	19-1
Contracts	19-7
20 ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES, PERMITTING, AND SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY IMPACT	20-1
Environmental Studies.....	20-1
Project Process and Permitting	20-2
Social or Community Requirements	20-9
Mine Closure Requirements	20-9
21 CAPITAL AND OPERATING COSTS	21-1
Capital Cost Estimates	21-1
Operating Cost Estimates.....	21-5
22 ECONOMIC ANALYSIS	22-1
23 ADJACENT PROPERTIES	23-1
24 OTHER RELEVANT DATA AND INFORMATION.....	24-1
25 INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS	25-1
26 RECOMMENDATIONS	26-1
27 REFERENCES	27-1
28 DATE AND SIGNATURE PAGE	28-1
29 CERTIFICATE OF QUALIFIED PERSON	29-1

LIST OF TABLES

	PAGE
Table 1-1 Summary Mineral Resource Estimate – Sep. 30, 2012	1-2
Table 1-2 Budget for Project Advancement.....	1-9
Table 1-3 Mineral Resource Estimate – Sep. 30, 2012.....	1-14
Table 1-4 Capital Cost Summary	1-18
Table 1-5 Unit Operating Cost Summary	1-18

Table 4-1	Summary of Licence and Claim Block Statistics	4-4
Table 10-1	Drill Hole Summary	10-3
Table 10-2	Significant intervals, Averages for Key Metals	10-5
Table 10-3	Significant Intervals, Averages for Key Oxides	10-6
Table 12-1	Summary of Original and Check Samples	12-4
Table 12-2	Summary of Bulk Density Check Samples.....	12-5
Table 13-1	Mineral List and Formulas	13-1
Table 13-2	Summary of the Beneficiation of 100 kg Sample of Foxtrot Material using Gravity and Magnetic Separation.....	13-7
Table 13-3	Flotation Test Result for Scoping Rougher Test	13-7
Table 13-4	Combined Gravity, Magnetic Separation and Flotation Concentrate Product	13-8
Table 13-5	Hydrometallurgical Leaching Studies on Foxtrot Concentrates	13-9
Table 13-6	Mixed Oxalate Precipitate of REE Recovered from Solution	13-11
Table 14-1	Summary Mineral Resource Estimate – Sep. 30, 2012	14-1
Table 14-2	Correlation Coefficients	14-7
Table 14-3	Summary Statistics for Felsic Samples	14-9
Table 14-4	Mineral Resources– September 30, 2012.....	14-22
Table 14-5	Sensitivity of Total Mineral Resources to Changes in the Dy Cut-off Grade	14-23
Table 16-1	Production Schedule	16-8
Table 16-2	Open Pit Mining Fleet.....	16-9
Table 19-1	Distribution of Rare Earths by Source – China.....	19-3
Table 19-2	Rare Earth Supply – 2008 & 2010.....	19-4
Table 19-3	REO Forecast Prices vs. Current Spot Prices.....	19-6
Table 20-1	Metal Mining Effluent Regulations, SOR/2002-222 – Authorized Limits of Deleterious Substances.....	20-5
Table 20-2	Provincial Authorizations	20-8
Table 21-1	Capital Cost Summary	21-1
Table 21-2	Surface Infrastructure Capital.....	21-2
Table 21-3	Mining Capital Cost	21-3
Table 21-4	Processing Facility Capital Cost.....	21-3
Table 21-5	Tailings Storage Facility Capital Cost.....	21-4
Table 21-6	Unit Operating Costs Summary	21-5
Table 21-7	Breakdown of Mill Operating Cost	21-6
Table 21-8	Manpower Summary	21-6
Table 22-1	Pre-Tax Cash Flow Summary	22-3
Table 22-2	Sensitivity Analysis.....	22-6
Table 26-1	Budget for Project Advancement.....	26-2

LIST OF FIGURES

	PAGE
Figure 4-1 Property Location Map	4-2
Figure 4-2 Location of the Foxtrot Project	4-3
Figure 7-1 Regional Geology.....	7-2
Figure 7-2 Local Geology	7-4
Figure 7-3 Property Cross Section	7-6
Figure 9-1 Magnetic Survey	9-2
Figure 9-2 Thorium Survey.....	9-3
Figure 9-3 Uranium Survey	9-4

Figure 10-1	Drill-Hole Locations Phase I and II	10-7
Figure 10-2	Drill-Hole Locations Phase III	10-8
Figure 11-1	Selected Results for Actlabs' Internal Quality Control Chart for Standards ..	11-3
Figure 11-2	Selected Results of Actlabs' Internal Quality Control for Duplicates	11-4
Figure 11-3	Selected Results for Search Mineral's External Quality Control for Standards.	11-5
Figure 11-4	Selected Results for Search Mineral's External Quality Control for Duplicates	11-6
Figure 12-1	Photograph of the Trenching Done During the 2011 Exploration Program...	12-2
Figure 12-2	Photograph of the Drill On Site	12-2
Figure 12-3	Selected Results from the 24 Check Samples Submitted to SGS Toronto...	12-6
Figure 13-1	Normalized Mineral Abundance of REE Minerals	13-2
Figure 13-2	Cumulative Grain Size Distribution	13-3
Figure 13-3	Gravity (Wilfley Table) and Magnetic Separation Flowsheet.....	13-6
Figure 13-4	Extraction of REE for the Acid Leach and Acid Bake – Water Leach Tests	13-10
Figure 14-1	Collar Locations of Holes and Location of Channel Samples used for 2011	
Resource Estimation		14-4
Figure 14-2	Topography Used For Resource Estimation	14-5
Figure 14-3	Histograms and Summary Statistics for Dysprosium and Neodymium for All	
Samples.....		14-8
Figure 14-4	Histograms and Summary Statistics for Dysprosium and Neodymium in Felsic	
Bands.		14-8
Figure 14-5	Average Variogram For All Elements in the Felsic Zone	14-11
Figure 14-6	Map View of Block Model.....	14-12
Figure 14-7	Longitudinal Section View of Block Model, Looking N15°E	14-13
Figure 14-8	West-Facing Cross-Section Showing the Interpretation of the Contacts of the	
FT and Road Belt Bands		14-15
Figure 14-9	West-Facing Cross-Section Showing the Grid of Local Dips Estimated from the	
Geological Information.....		14-16
Figure 14-10	Example of Check of Block Estimates and Classification on Cross-Section	
2350.....		14-20
Figure 16-1	Isometric View of Foxtrot Pit Shell Looking NW	16-6
Figure 16-2	General Site Plan	16-7
Figure 17-1	Process Flow Sheet	17-2
Figure 18-1	Tailings Storage Facility	18-5
Figure 19-1	Chinese Rare Earth Export Quotas by Year	19-4
Figure 22-1	NPV Sensitivity Analysis	22-7
Figure 22-2	IRR Sensitivity Analysis	22-7

1 SUMMARY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Roscoe Postle Associates Inc. (RPA) was retained by Search Minerals Inc. (Search Minerals), to prepare an independent Technical Report on the Foxtrot Rare Earth Element (REE) Project (Foxtrot Project) near Port Hope Simpson, Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada. The purpose of this report is to disclose an updated Mineral Resource estimate for the Foxtrot Project, incorporating results from three phases of drilling. This Technical Report conforms to National Instrument 43-101 (NI 43-101) Standards of Disclosure for Mineral Projects. RPA visited the Foxtrot Project site and field office on October 27, 2011.

Search Minerals is a public company that trades on the TSX Venture Exchange under the symbol SMY. Search Minerals is currently exploring 19 prospects on three REE properties in Labrador, Canada and holds additional properties in Newfoundland.

Table 1-1 summarizes the Mineral Resource estimate as of September 30, 2012.

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY MINERAL RESOURCE ESTIMATE – SEP. 30, 2012
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Classification	Zone	Tonnage (000 t)	Dy (ppm)	Nd (ppm)	Y (ppm)	HREE+Y (%)	TREE+Y (%)
Indicated	Central	9,229	189	1,442	1,040	0.17	0.88
Indicated	Extensions	--	--	--	--	--	--
Indicated Total		9,229	189	1,442	1,040	0.17	0.88
Inferred	Central	3,291	178	1,339	982	0.16	0.83
Inferred	Extensions	1,874	171	1,046	960	0.16	0.67
Inferred Total		5,165	176	1,233	974	0.16	0.77

Classification	Zone	Tonnage (000 t)	Dy ₂ O ₃ (ppm)	Nd ₂ O ₃ (ppm)	Y ₂ O ₃ (ppm)	HREO+Y (%)	TREO+Y (%)
Indicated	Central	9,229	218	1,687	1,345	0.21	1.07
Indicated	Extensions	--	--	--	--	--	--
Indicated Total		9,229	217	1,687	1,320	0.21	1.06
Inferred	Central	3,291	205	1,567	1,247	0.20	1.00
Inferred	Extensions	1,874	197	1,224	1,219	0.19	0.81
Inferred Total		5,165	202	1,442	1,237	0.20	0.93

Notes:

1. CIM definitions were followed for Mineral Resources.
2. Mineral Resources are estimated at a cut-off grade of 130 ppm Dy.
3. Numbers may not add due to rounding.
4. Heavy Rare Earth Elements (HREE) = Eu+Gd+Tb+Dy+Ho+Er+Tm+Yb+Lu+Y
5. Light Rare Earth Elements (LREE) = La+Ce+Pr+Nd+Sm
6. Total Rare Earth Elements (TREE) = sum of HREE and LREE
7. HREO, LREO refer to oxides of heavy and light rare earth elements respectively, and TREO is the sum of HREO and LREO.
8. Resources have been estimated inside a preliminary pit shell.

GEOLOGY AND MINERAL RESOURCE CONCLUSIONS

The Mineral Resource estimate uses a cut-off grade of 130 ppm dysprosium. This reporting cut-off grade, which corresponds to 150 ppm for the oxide form, Dy₂O₃, produces a Net Smelter Return (NSR) value considerably higher than the anticipated cost of mining and processing. RPA considers that material with more than 130 ppm Dy meets the requirement of the Canadian Institute of Mining, Metallurgy and Petroleum (CIM) Definition Standards that Mineral Resources have a reasonable prospect of economic extraction.

Indicated Mineral Resources are estimated to total 9.23 Mt at 0.88% TREE (Total Rare Earth Elements) (or 1.07% TREO), and Inferred Mineral Resources are estimated to total 5.17 Mt at 0.77% TREE (or 0.93% TREO).

With the Central Area of the deposit still open at depth, future resource estimates will likely report higher tonnages, both of Indicated and Inferred Resources. The grade of the deeper resource currently appears to be similar to the shallower resource, so future resource estimates are likely to have similar grades to the current resource estimate, but with higher tonnages.

There is potential for the delineation of additional resources along strike, both east and west of the Central Area. The Phase III drilling targeted the Central Area at depth; future drilling should include deeper holes on the sections immediately adjacent to the Central Area. The recent drilling indicates that the most promising sections appear to be those immediately to the east of the Central Area.

Within the FT and Road Belt bands of the Central Area which host the rare-earth mineralization, the mineralization with economic potential is hosted in bands of felsic volcanics that are inter-layered with mafic bands. The first three phases of drilling have confirmed that it is possible to visually identify the felsic mineralization from the mafic; statistical analysis of the multi-element ICP data for the resource estimation studies also suggests that it is possible to identify the felsic material using automated classification based on major-element chemistry. The combination of a characteristic visual appearance and a characteristic multi-element signature creates many possibilities for efficient and effective grade control. There are optical and chemical sorting technologies that should be very effective at segregating the higher-grade material from the mixed volcanics.

Statistical analysis of the assay data from the felsic samples shows that there is a bi-modal distribution in the felsic bands. With the higher-grade population having grades about five times those of the lower-grade population, it may be possible to further upgrade the run-of-mine material into an even higher-grade product in fewer ore tonnes. To realize this possibility, a better understanding of the geology and mineralogy of the two felsic populations is needed.

The very strong correlations between the rare earth elements will simplify grade control. The entire rare earth suite of elements occurs as single package at Foxtrot, and a potential future mining operation will not have to contend with the complications of having to mine material that has low grades of some REEs in order to recover higher grades of other REEs.

With much of the high-grade mineralization lying in the southern third of the FT band, there is a possibility that the vast majority of the metal content may lie along a roughly tabular structure that is amenable to underground mining. An underground operation should be further studied, including the possibility of an underground operation that begins from the floor of a small starter pit.

PRELIMINARY ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT CONCLUSIONS

RPA disclosed the results of a Preliminary Economic Assessment (PEA) in a Technical Report dated July 15, 2012 (Cox et al., 2012) prepared for Search Minerals. The PEA was based on Mineral Resources estimated using the first two phases of drilling, and evaluated an open pit mining approach combined with processing by gravity, magnetic separation, and flotation concentration, followed by acid baking and water leaching, producing a mixed rare earth carbonate concentrate. The PEA results have not yet been updated using the Sep. 30, 2012 Mineral Resource estimate disclosed in this report.

In RPA's opinion, the following conclusions presented in the July 15, 2012 PEA report remain valid.

The PEA indicated that positive economic results can be obtained for the Foxtrot Project, in a scenario that includes open pit mining and rare earth recovery by acid baking/water leaching.

The life-of-mine (LOM) plan for the Project indicated that 14.3 Mt, at an average grade of 0.58% TREE, could be mined over 10 years at a nominal production rate of 4,000 tpd. REE production was projected to total 66 million kg.

Specific conclusions are as follows.

MINING

The July 15, 2012 PEA investigated production rates in the 3,000 tpd to 4,000 tpd range, for both open pit and underground mining methods. Within 200 m of surface, strip ratios remain

low enough for open pit methods to produce more favourable results. Underground mining remains worth consideration when Phase III drilling (to more than 400 m depth) is incorporated into the resource estimate.

The July 15, 2012 PEA production rate is 1,440,000 tpa or 4,000 tpd of REE bearing material. Mining of ore and waste (no pre-stripping of overburden is required, as the deposit is exposed on surface) would be carried out by the owner and by contractor to balance mining equipment requirements over the life of the operation.

The combination of owner-operated and contract mining will be carried out using a conventional open pit method consisting of the following activities:

- Drilling performed by conventional production drills.
- Blasting using ANFO (ammonium-nitrate fuel oil) and a down-hole delay initiation system.
- Loading and hauling operations performed with hydraulic shovel, front-end loader, and rigid frame haulage trucks.

Geotechnical and pit design parameters are assumptions based on comparable operations, and require site-specific investigation as the Project advances.

PROCESSING AND METALLURGY

Metallurgical testwork involved three beneficiation techniques to concentrate the REE in the Foxtrot sample, including Wilfley tabling, magnetic separation and flotation. The Wilfley tabling was used to test amenability to gravity concentration. Magnetic separation was used to reject magnetite from the Wilfley concentrates. Flotation was tested both as a primary method of concentration for the Foxtrot sample and as a scavenging method to recover additional REE from the Wilfley tails. The work was preliminary in nature.

Recovery of REEs from the combined beneficiation results ranged from 80% to 86%.

The gravity concentrate and the combined gravity/flotation concentrate were subjected to hydrometallurgical processing by acid leaching or acid baking at 200°C to 250°C followed by water leaching. The acid bake and water leach results produced high extractions.

Overall recoveries range from 79% to 82% for light rare earths, and 73% to 78% for heavy rare earths.

The process proposed for the PEA utilizes the following basic unit operations: crushing, grinding, gravity recovery, magnetic separation, flotation, acid bake, water leaching, and solution purification to recover a mixed REE product.

ENVIRONMENT

The Project is at an early stage, and Search Minerals has not yet begun environmental baseline work or community consultation. Despite that, RPA does not anticipate any fatal flaws regarding environmental issues with the Project as proposed. The challenges normal to permitting and developing an open pit mine in Labrador are expected to be manageable.

MARKETS

The market for rare earth products is small and public information on price forecasts and sales terms are difficult to obtain. Current prices are tracked by sources such as Asian Metal and Metal-PagesTM, based on transactions.

Recent history shows international rare earth market prices growing at an unprecedented rate since China cut export quotas by approximately 40% in 2011, then falling throughout 2012. China's overwhelming control on the rare earth supply chain, from upstream mining to downstream processing and end-user products, is likely to remain intact on all but a few materials through 2016. Rare earth prices are expected to remain volatile in the short term.

Price forecasting in this environment is difficult, and certain to contain wide margins of error.

A small number of REE producers outside of China are likely to be in operation by the time the Foxtrot Project is developed. This is expected to saturate the market for some LREO such as lanthanum and cerium, however, demand for high-value HREO (such as dysprosium) is expected to grow, and supply is expected to remain in deficit. Revenue for the Foxtrot Project is dominated by dysprosium, neodymium, and terbium, elements that are projected to remain in supply deficit.

Rare earth prices were selected from the low end of a range of available forecasts, averaging \$38/kg of REO (net of separation charges). Q2 2012 spot prices, for comparison, average \$99/kg REO (net).

RPA considers these rare earths prices to be appropriate for a PEA-level study, however, we note that the recent market volatility introduces considerably more uncertainty than a comparable base or precious metals project. This uncertainty is mitigated to some extent, by the selection of conservative rare earths pricing.

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

The economic analysis is taken from the July 15, 2012 PEA (Cox et al., 2012) and is based on the Mineral Resource estimate at that time. The economic analysis has not been updated to reflect the updated Mineral Resources contained in this report.

The July 15, 2012 PEA is considered by RPA to meet the requirements of a PEA as defined in Canadian NI 43-101 regulations. The economic analysis contained in this section is based, in part, on Inferred Resources, and is preliminary in nature. Inferred Resources are considered too geologically speculative to have mining and economic considerations applied to them and to be categorized as Mineral Reserves. There is no certainty that the reserves development, production, and economic forecasts on which the July 15, 2012 PEA was based will be realized.

RPA conducted an economic analysis of the Foxtrot Project applying operating and capital costs estimates based on a 10 year production schedule.

The total life-of-mine capital is approximately \$494 million, including approximately \$103 million in contingency capital. The average operating cost over the life of the project is approximately \$96 per tonne milled.

The Foxtrot Project will process an average of 1,440,000 tpa at an average grade of 0.58% Total Rare Earth Elements (TREE), and produce an average of 6.5 million kilograms of payable rare earth material per year.

The economic analysis shows that, at an average Total Rare Earth Oxide (TREO) basket price of \$38 per kilogram, the project yields a pre-tax net NPV at a 10% discount rate of \$408

million. Total pre-tax undiscounted cash flow is \$1.1 billion. Over the life of mine, the pre-tax Internal Rate of Return is 28.5% with a payback period of approximately 2.8 years.

The pre-tax NPV at varying discount rates is as follows:

- \$408 million at a 10% discount rate
- \$504 million at an 8% discount rate
- \$686 million at a 5% discount rate

RECOMMENDATIONS

RPA recommends that Search Minerals continue collecting data to support the feasibility and licensing process, and proceed with further engineering studies.

Specific recommendations by area are as follows:

GEOLOGY & MINERAL RESOURCES

- Further drilling should be done, both at depth in the Central Area, and at depth in the extensions immediately adjacent to the Central Area. The deposit remains open at depth along its entire strike, even after the Phase III drilling program, which extended the strong mineralization to a depth of at least 400 m in the Central Area. Future drilling should continue to test the deep extensions of the resource in the Central Area and should test the shallower lateral extensions of the resource.
- The geological logging of the Phase I through Phase III drill holes should again be reviewed for consistency. The designation of the FT2, FT3, FT4 bands is not consistent in the FT zone. In the Road Belt zone the designation of the Road Belt counterparts to the FT bands should be reviewed for consistency.
- During drilling, the quality assurance / quality control (QA/QC) data from Search Mineral's external monitoring program, as well as from Actlabs' internal monitoring program, should be reviewed monthly in order to identify batches of samples that may need to be re-analyzed, or to identify single samples for which a duplicate analysis would be useful. Although a good program has been in place for gathering QA/QC data during Phases I through III, the data from this program are usually assessed after the drilling has been completed. Regular monthly review of the QA/QC data, problems with accuracy and precision cannot be dealt with in a timely manner.
- Search Minerals should obtain certified reference materials with REE grades similar to those found at the Foxtrot Project.

MINING

- Update PEA with results of current Mineral Resource estimate.

- Carry out geotechnical investigation for use in determining pit slopes and underground stope sizing.
- There are two factors that point to the viability of an underground mining operation: i) the concentration of the majority of the in situ metal along roughly tabular structures that are steeply dipping; ii) the continuity of strong mineralization to depths of more than 400 m. An underground operation should be further studied, including the possibility of an underground operation that begins from the floor of a small starter pit.

METALLURGICAL TESTWORK

- The mafic and felsic material are inter-mixed on a fine scale. With the felsic material carrying the majority of the mineralization, it would be useful to have some test work done on ore sorting possibilities, such as optical or x-ray sorting.
- If mafic material cannot be effectively segregated from felsic material, then some metallurgical test work is needed on the effect of mafic material in the run-of-mine ore feed. The felsic material has been the focus of test work; it would be useful to establish the effect on metallurgical recovery from the felsic material when it has been diluted by 10% to 20% mafic material.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

- Begin a program of environmental baseline study work.
- Engage in community and Aboriginal consultation regarding plans for the Project.

A budget for these recommendations has been estimated, as summarized in Table 1-2:

TABLE 1-2 BUDGET FOR PROJECT ADVANCEMENT
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Item	Cost (C\$)
Infill drilling (40,000 m @ \$150/m)	6,000,000
Mineral Resource Update	100,000
Engineering Study	100,000
Metallurgical Testwork	100,000
Geotechnical Investigation	300,000
Environmental Baseline Studies	500,000
Total	\$7,100,000

TECHNICAL SUMMARY

PROPERTY LOCATION

The Foxtrot Project is located in southeast Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada, centered at 580000E, and 5806000N, UTM Grid Zone 21N, NAD83. The Project is located approximately 36 km east southeast of Port Hope Simpson, Labrador, and approximately ten kilometres west of St. Lewis, Labrador.

LAND TENURE

The Foxtrot Project is centrally located on contiguous claim blocks under 20 different licences, with a total of 734 claim blocks, each 500 m by 500 m, covering an area of 18,350 ha. Claims are either registered to Search Minerals or to Alterra Resources Inc. (Alterra), a wholly owned subsidiary of Search Minerals. No surface rights for construction or quarrying are known to exist. At the time of writing, all claims were held in good standing.

LOCAL RESOURCES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The nearby communities of Port Hope Simpson, St. Lewis, and Mary's Harbour have port access as well as airstrips that can facilitate transportation of goods required for exploration programs. St. Lewis has an ice-free harbour with deep water dock facilities and a small gravel airstrip suitable for small aircraft. Port Hope Simpson, St. Lewis, and Mary's Harbour, which have populations of approximately 500, 300, and 400 respectively, have various services including grocery stores, hardware stores, hotels, and heavy equipment for rent and labourers for hire.

There is no electricity available on the Project site. The closest source is diesel generated electricity in the town of St. Lewis, ten kilometres away.

Water sources are plentiful at the Property.

HISTORY

Search Minerals began actively trading on the TSX-V under the symbol SMY after it successfully acquired all outstanding shares of Alterra, and made it a wholly-owned subsidiary. Alterra holds approximately 4,000 mineral claims including claims in the Port Hope Simpson REE district (PHS). Search Minerals began extensive exploration on the

district in late 2009 after it entered into a binding letter of intent to acquire an undivided 100% interest in certain claims in southeast Labrador owned by B and A Minerals Inc. known as the Port Hope Simpson property. Subsequent staking acquired adjacent land, including the Fox Harbour property and the Foxtrot Project.

Search Minerals began exploration on the Fox Harbour property within the PHS in the winter of 2009, conducting an airborne radiometric and magnetometer survey completed by Aeroquest. Within the Fox Harbour property, the Foxtrot Project was the main area of interest due to its elevated radiometric and magnetometer values.

Exploration in 2010 consisted of prospecting, mapping, lithogeochemical grab sampling, clearing, hand trenching, channel sampling with a portable circular saw, and diamond drilling. This exploration program was conducted across the entire Fox Harbour volcanic belt, with the main area of focus being the Foxtrot Project.

Search Minerals commenced a Phase I drill program at Foxtrot Project in Q4 2010. The Phase I drill program consisted of 23 drill holes totalling 3,955 m to a depth of 100 m and along two kilometres of strike. A Phase II drill program was completed in Q3 2011 and consisted of 20 drill holes totalling 4,083 m to a depth of 200 m along a 500 m strike.

A Phase III drill program commenced in Q4 2011 and was completed in Q1 2012, and consisted of 29 diamond drill holes totalling 10,896 m.

There are no historical resource or reserves estimates on the Foxtrot Project.

There has been no past production on the Foxtrot Project.

GEOLOGY AND MINERALIZATION

The Fox Harbour property contains three extensive east-west to north-west trending volcanic belts (Road Belt, Mt Belt, and South Belt), extending upwards of 30 km in length, and 50 m to 500 m in width. These volcanic belts are largely bound by megacrystic granitic augen gneiss, which is variably mylonitized at contacts. The Foxtrot Project is located within the central volcanic belt. These volcanic belts are interpreted to be bi-modal mafic and felsic volcanics, with intercalated volcanoclastic units located largely at contacts and within the mafic volcanics. Mafic volcanics contain large epidote pods, up to one metre by 0.5 m in

length and width, along with differential weathering of individual layers, indicating a volcanic protolith. The felsic volcanics have very consistent stratigraphy that can be followed based on the stratigraphic contacts, indicative weathering, mineralogy, geochemistry, magnetic susceptibility, aeromagnetic survey, and ground-based magnetic survey.

All phases of drilling targeted the Mt Belt, a zone of inter-layered bands of mafic and felsic volcanic that lies between a mafic gneiss to the south and an augen gneiss to the north. This belt is predominantly felsic, with thinner bands of mafic volcanics tending to separate thicker bands of felsic volcanic.

All of the currently discovered mineralization with economic potential lies in the felsic bands of the Mt Belt, with the highest grades lying in a continuous band that has been locally designated as the FT3 by Search Minerals geologists. Other continuous and semi-continuous bands of felsic rocks, such as the FT2, FT2x, FT3b, FT4, and FT5, contain REE mineralization that is either lower in grade or more spatially erratic/tinner.

The Fox Harbour bi-modal felsic and mafic volcanic package is host to REE mineralization. The Foxtrot Project is the thickest currently identified occurrence of these volcanic rocks in the Fox Harbour area. Mineralization in the Foxtrot Project is largely allanite, zircon, chevkinite, and fergusonite. Higher-grade mineralization occurs within specific volcanic packages that can be followed for tens of kilometres. These higher-grade zones are characterized by a dark groundmass, consisting of the mineral assemblage that includes all or some of the following minerals: magnetite, pyroxene, amphibole, amazonite, and biotite.

EXPLORATION STATUS

A Phase III exploration drill program was completed in Q1 2012 and consisted of 29 diamond drill holes totalling 10,896 m to a depth of 450 m along a 600 m strike. The drilling area focused on the thicker portion of FT3, which is approximately 10m to 25 m true width. The current Mineral Resource estimate is based on data from all three phases of drilling.

MINERAL RESOURCES

RPA estimated Mineral Resources on the Foxtrot Project deposit using drill hole and assay data available as of April 2012. As of this cut-off date, a total of 14,837 assays were available, with a total length of 17,827m.

The Mineral Resource estimate uses a cut-off grade of 130 ppm on dysprosium. Using preliminary assessments of metal prices and metallurgical recoveries, this reporting cut-off, which corresponds to 150 ppm on Dy_2O_3 , produces an NSR value considerably higher than the cost of mining and processing ore. Even with changes and uncertainties in the metal prices, recoveries and costs, material with more than 130 ppm Dy meets the requirement of the CIM Definition Standards: that Mineral Resources have a reasonable prospect of economic extraction.

The resources have been constrained by an ultimate pit shell to ensure that it properly reflects a geometry that is amenable to open pit mining methods. Mineral Resources have been estimated to a vertical depth of 435 m, and remain open at depth.

Indicated Mineral Resources are estimated to total 9.23 Mt at 1.07% TREO, and Inferred Mineral Resources are estimated to total 5.17 Mt at 0.93% TREO (Table 1-3).

TABLE 1-3 MINERAL RESOURCE ESTIMATE – SEP. 30, 2012
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

		Central	Indicated Extensions	Total	Central	Inferred Extensions	Total
Tonnage (t)		9,229,000	--	9,229,000	3,291,000	1,874,000	5,165,000
Element	Units						
Y	ppm	1,040	--	1,040	982	960	974
La	ppm	1,646	--	1,646	1,564	1,183	1,426
Ce	ppm	3,337	--	3,337	3,139	2,429	2,881
Pr	ppm	384	--	384	359	280	330
Nd	ppm	1,442	--	1,442	1,339	1,046	1,233
Sm	ppm	262	--	262	245	197	228
Eu	ppm	13	--	13	12	9	11
Gd	ppm	205	--	205	193	165	183
Tb	ppm	33	--	33	30	28	30
Dy	ppm	189	--	189	178	171	176
Ho	ppm	37	--	37	35	34	34
Er	ppm	103	--	103	98	98	98
Tm	ppm	15	--	15	14	15	14
Yb	ppm	92	--	92	88	95	91
Lu	ppm	14	--	14	13	15	14
Zr	ppm	9,619	--	9,619	9,538	10,987	10,064
Nb	ppm	626	--	626	585	455	538
LREE	%	0.71	--	0.71	0.66	0.51	0.61
HREE	%	0.17	--	0.17	0.16	0.16	0.16
TREE	%	0.88	--	0.88	0.83	0.67	0.77
Oxide	Units						
Y ₂ O ₃	ppm	1,320	--	1,320	1,247	1,219	1,237
La ₂ O ₃	ppm	1,926	--	1,926	1,830	1,385	1,669
CeO ₂	ppm	4,105	--	4,105	3,861	2,988	3,544
Pr ₆ O ₁₁	ppm	465	--	465	434	339	400
Nd ₂ O ₃	ppm	1,687	--	1,687	1,567	1,224	1,442
Sm ₂ O ₃	ppm	303	--	303	285	228	264
Eu ₂ O ₃	ppm	15	--	15	14	10	13
Gd ₂ O ₃	ppm	236	--	236	222	190	210
Tb ₄ O ₇	ppm	38	--	38	36	33	35
Dy ₂ O ₃	ppm	217	--	217	205	197	202
Ho ₂ O ₃	ppm	42	--	42	40	39	39
Er ₂ O ₃	ppm	118	--	118	112	112	112
Tm ₂ O ₃	ppm	17	--	17	16	17	16
Yb ₂ O ₃	ppm	105	--	105	100	109	103
Lu ₂ O ₃	ppm	16	--	16	15	17	16
ZrO ₂	ppm	12,985	--	12,985	12,877	14,832	13,586
Nb ₂ O ₅	ppm	789	--	789	737	573	677
LREO	%	0.85	--	0.85	0.8	0.62	0.73
HREO	%	0.21	--	0.21	0.2	0.19	0.2
TREO	%	1.06	--	1.07	1.05	0.81	0.93

Notes:

1. CIM definitions were followed for Mineral Resources.
2. Mineral Resources are estimated at a cut-off grade of 130 ppm Dy.
3. Numbers may not add due to rounding.
4. Heavy Rare Earth Elements (HREE) = Eu+Gd+Tb+Dy+Ho+Er+Tm+Yb+Lu+Y
5. Light Rare Earth Elements (LREE) = La+Ce+Pr+Nd+Sm
6. Total Rare Earth Elements (TREE) = sum of HREE and LREE

7. HREO, LREO refer to oxides of heavy and light rare earth elements respectively, and TREO is the sum of HREO and LREO.
8. Resources have been estimated inside a preliminary pit shell.

The following sections have been taken from the July 15, 2012 PEA, and have not been updated with the results of the current resource estimate.

MINING METHODS

RPA investigated the potential for open pit mining of the Sep. 30, 2011 Indicated and Inferred Mineral Resources. Open pit and underground mining options were evaluated with run of mine (ROM) material being processed at a rate of 3,000 tpd to 4,000 tpd in a process plant on site producing a mixed rare earth product. At estimated operating costs, open pit mining was found to be the more profitable option.

Mining of mineralized material and waste will be carried out by the owner and by contractor to balance mining equipment requirements over the life of the operation. No pre-stripping of overburden is required, as the deposit is exposed on surface.

The combination of owner-operated and contract mining will be carried out using a conventional open pit method consisting of drilling, blasting, loading, and hauling operations. The production equipment will be supported by bulldozers, graders, and water trucks.

Pit optimizations were performed based on typical costs for comparable operations and projects of a similar scale. In the absence of geotechnical information, pit slope angles were selected based on an industry average of 45°.

Production quantities total 14.3 Mt of potentially mineable ore, at a grade of 0.58% total REE. This includes dilution of the mineralized felsic material with the intercalated mafic material in each block (assumed to have zero grade). The mafic material portion within mineralized blocks in the final pit shell supporting the above tonnage is equivalent to an internal dilution of 27.7%. A 100% mining recovery factor was applied. Waste within the pit shell totals 105.8 Mt, resulting in an average strip ratio of 7.4:1.

The proportion of Inferred Resources in the material that may be potentially mineable via open pit is approximately 65%.

Highlights of the production schedule are as follow:

- Pre-production period of two years
- Ramp-up to full production in Year 1
- Production of 1,440,000 tonnes per year, or 4,000 tpd
- Waste mining average of 10.6 Mt per year
- Contractor assistance with high waste mining requirements in years 3 to 6

MINERAL PROCESSING AND METALLURGICAL TESTING

Three beneficiation techniques were studied in order to concentrate the REE in the Foxtrot sample, including Wilfley tabling, magnetic separation, and flotation. The work was preliminary in nature.

The metallurgical process has been studied from initial recovery of a REE concentrate through to the purification of a leach solution and precipitation of a mixed product. Average recovery used in the July 15, 2012 PEA was 79%. These results show that conventional beneficiation methods may be used to recover the REE minerals. Additional testwork using more selective beneficiation or incorporation of cleaning steps in the circuit may improve recoveries.

The recommended process will utilize the crushing, grinding, gravity recovery, magnetic separation, flotation, water leaching, acid bake, and solution purification to recover a mixed REE product.

Ore will be crushed, ground and screened to produce a suitable sized product for gravity recovery. The product will be subjected to magnetic separation to remove magnetite. The tailings from the gravity recovery step will be subjected to flotation to increase REE recovery.

The non-magnetics and the flotation concentrate will be combined and sent to acid baking, and then to a water leaching step. The product from water leaching will go to solid liquid separation, with the REE containing solution sent to solution purification. After solution purification, oxalic acid will be added to the remaining solution to form REO containing

precipitate. This precipitate will be sent to solid/liquid separation to provide a solid mixed REO product, and a liquid residue.

ENVIRONMENTAL, PERMITTING, AND SOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The Project will require environmental baseline study work to support permitting efforts and assist in Project design to avoid or minimize potential adverse effects. RPA is not aware of any baseline work completed to date.

Mining projects in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador are subject to Environmental Assessment (EA) under the Newfoundland and Labrador Environmental Protection Act. They can also be subject to an environmental assessment under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA) if an approval is required from a federal agency. All provincial and federal EA processes are public.

The implementation of an effective community and Aboriginal engagement program is fundamental to the successful environmental permitting of mining projects. The purpose of this program is to ensure that all potentially affected persons, businesses, and communities have a full understanding of the Project and an opportunity to share information with respect to concerns regarding potential effects, and so the proponent has an opportunity to explain how these concerns are addressed in the Project design and operations. This program typically begins in the early stages of project planning and continues through the life of the Project.

A formal Rehabilitation and Closure Plan is required to obtain approval for project development under the Newfoundland and Labrador Mining Act. This plan is required to be submitted with or immediately following the submission of the Project Development Plan and provides the basis for the establishment of the Financial Assurance for the Project. The Mining Act requirements will only be reviewed following release of the project from Environmental Assessment, and the review and approval process can typically take four months to one year.

While RPA has not completed a closure plan for the Project, an allowance of \$19 million has been included in the July 15, 2012 PEA cash flow. This estimate is based on comparison to similar projects.

CAPITAL AND OPERATING COST ESTIMATES

CAPITAL COSTS

The mine, mill and site infrastructure costs from the July 15, 2012 PEA are summarized in Table 1-4. All costs in this section are in 2012 Canadian dollars unless otherwise specified.

TABLE 1-4 CAPITAL COST SUMMARY
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Cost Area	Initial (C\$ million)	Sustaining (C\$ million)
Surface Infrastructure	41.0	3.7
Mining	36.7	9.3
Processing	138.4	6.1
Tailings	29.1	10.0
Owners/Indirect Costs	61.3	0.0
Rehabilitation & Mine Closure	0.0	19.0
EPCM	36.8	0.0
Contingency	103.0	0.0
Total	446.3	48.1

For the purpose of the economic analysis, the total capital cost including initial and sustaining capital costs is \$494.4 million.

OPERATING COSTS

Mine life average operating unit costs for the Project are shown in Table 1-5.

TABLE 1-5 UNIT OPERATING COST SUMMARY
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Cost area	LOM Unit Cost (C\$/t milled)	LOM Unit Cost (C\$/t moved)
Mining (Owner/Contractor)	35.64	4.24
Processing	52.50	
G&A	8.12	
Total Operating Cost	96.26	

The expected accuracy of the operating and capital cost estimates is of PEA study level ($\pm 35\%$).

2 INTRODUCTION

Roscoe Postle Associates Inc. (RPA) was retained by Search Minerals Inc. (Search Minerals), to prepare an independent Technical Report on the Foxtrot Rare Earth Element (REE) Project (Foxtrot Project) near Port Hope Simpson, Labrador, Canada. The purpose of this report is to disclose an updated Mineral Resource estimate for the Foxtrot Project. This Technical Report conforms to National Instrument 43-101 (NI 43-101) Standards of Disclosure for Mineral Projects. RPA visited the Foxtrot Project site and field house on October 27, 2011.

Search Minerals is a public company that trades on the TSX Venture Exchange under the symbol SMY. Search Minerals is currently exploring 19 prospects on three REE properties in Labrador, Canada and holds additional properties in Newfoundland.

RPA disclosed the results of a Preliminary Economic Assessment (PEA) in a Technical Report dated July 15, 2012 (Cox et al., 2012) prepared for Search Minerals. The PEA was based on Mineral Resources at the Project estimated as of July 15, 2012 and evaluated an open pit mining approach combined with processing by gravity, magnetic separation, and flotation concentration, followed by acid baking and water leaching, producing a mixed rare earth carbonate concentrate. The pre-production period will be two years and the mine life will be ten years. The processing rate will be 4,000 tpd with an average mill recovery of 79%.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Jacques Gauthier, P.Eng., RPA Principal Mining Engineer, and Rick Breger, Benchmark Six Inc. geologist, visited Search Mineral's Foxtrot Project site to carry out a site visit on October 27, 2011. On site Mr. Gauthier and Mr. Breger observed exploration activities and visited the Project's field house to examine core.

Discussions were held with personnel related to the Project:

- Mr. James D. Clucas, President, CEO, Director, Search Minerals Inc.
- Dr. David B. Dreisinger, Ph.D., Vice President – Technology, Director, Search Minerals Inc.

- Dr. Randy Miller, Ph.D., P.Geo, Vice President – Exploration, Search Minerals Inc.
- James Haley, B.Sc., Project Geologist, Search Minerals Inc.
- Michael Upshall, GIS Analyst, Search Minerals Inc.
- Rob Hoffman, Lithogeochemistry Manager, Activation Laboratories Ltd.
- Nicole Devereaux, Geologist, Search Minerals Inc.

Mr. R. Mohan Srivastava, P.Geo, associate consulting geologist with RPA, and President of Benchmark Six, has reviewed all of the data and information gathered during the site visit and has overall responsibility for the resource estimation.

The documentation reviewed, and other sources of information, are listed at the end of this report in Section 27 References.

RARE EARTH ELEMENTS

In this report, the following abbreviations are used:

- Heavy Rare Earth Elements (HREE) = Eu+Gd+Tb+Dy+Ho+Er+Tm+Yb+Lu+Y
- Light Rare Earth Elements (LREE) = La+Ce+Pr+Nd+Sm
- Total Rare Earth Elements (TREO or REE) = sum of HREE and LREE

LREO and HREO refer to oxides of light and heavy rare earth elements respectively. In this document, TREO (Total Rare Earth Oxides) refers to LREO and HREO collectively.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Units of measurement used in this report conform to the Metric system. All currency in this report is Canadian dollars (C\$) unless otherwise noted.

μ	micron	kW	kilowatt
°C	degree Celsius	kWh	kilowatt-hour
°F	degree Fahrenheit	L	litre
μg	microgram	LREE	light rare earth elements
A	ampere	LREO	light rare earth oxides
a	annum	L/s	litres per second
bbl	barrels	m	metre
Btu	British thermal units	M	mega (million)
C\$	Canadian dollars	m ²	square metre
cal	calorie	m ³	cubic metre
cfm	cubic feet per minute	min	minute
cm	centimetre	MASL	metres above sea level
cm ²	square centimetre	mm	millimetre
d	day	mph	miles per hour
dia.	diameter	MVA	megavolt-amperes
dmt	dry metric tonne	MW	megawatt
dwt	dead-weight ton	MWh	megawatt-hour
ft	foot	m ³ /h	cubic metres per hour
ft/s	foot per second	opt, oz/st	ounce per short ton
ft ²	square foot	oz	Troy ounce (31.1035g)
ft ³	cubic foot	ppm	part per million
g	gram	psia	pound per square inch absolute
G	giga (billion)	psig	pound per square inch gauge
Gal	Imperial gallon	REE	rare earth element
g/L	gram per litre	REO	rare earth oxide
g/t	gram per tonne	RL	relative elevation
gpm	Imperial gallons per minute	s	second
gr/ft ³	grain per cubic foot	st	short ton
gr/m ³	grain per cubic metre	stpa	short ton per year
hr	hour	stpd	short ton per day
HREE	heavy rare earth elements	t	metric tonne
HREO	heavy rare earth oxides	t/m ³	tonnes per cubic metre
ha	hectare	tpa	metric tonne per year
hp	horsepower	tpd	metric tonne per day
in	inch	TREE	total rare earth elements
in ²	square inch	TREO	total rare earth oxides
J	joule	US\$	United States dollar
k	kilo (thousand)	USg	United States gallon
kcal	kilocalorie	USgpm	US gallon per minute
kg	kilogram	V	volt
km	kilometre	W	watt
km/h	kilometre per hour	wmt	wet metric tonne
km ²	square kilometre	yd ³	cubic yard
kPa	kilopascal	yr	year
kVA	kilovolt-amperes		

3 RELIANCE ON OTHER EXPERTS

This report has been prepared by RPA for Search Minerals. The information, conclusions, opinions, and estimates contained herein are based on:

- Information available to RPA at the time of preparation of this report,
- Assumptions, conditions, and qualifications as set forth in this report, and
- Data, reports, and other information supplied by Search Minerals and other third party sources.

For the purpose of this report, RPA has relied on ownership information provided by Search Minerals. RPA has not researched property title or mineral rights for the Foxtrot Project and expresses no opinion as to the ownership status of the property.


Except for the purposes legislated under provincial securities law, any use of this report by any third party is at that party's sole risk.


4 PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

Search Minerals began to acquire property in the Port Hope Simpson area in 2009 when it announced it had entered into a binding letter of intent with B and A Minerals Inc. to acquire an undivided 100% interest in their Port Hope Simpson property. Additional property was staked shortly after (by Alterra/Search Minerals) to acquire the adjacent Fox Harbour volcanic belt, which contains the Foxtrot Project, based on Search's REE exploration model. Since then the company has conducted exploration programs at the Foxtrot Project drilling approximately 19,000 m to a depth of 450 m.

The Foxtrot Project is located in southeast Labrador, Canada, centered at 580000E, and 5806000N, UTM Grid Zone 21N, NAD83 (Figures 4-1 and 4-2). The Project is located approximately 36 km east-southeast of Port Hope Simpson, Labrador, and approximately ten kilometres west of St. Lewis, Labrador.





CLAIMS, STANDING, AND LAND TENURE

The Foxtrot Project is centrally located on contiguous claim blocks, under 20 different licences, with a total of 734, 500 m by 500 m claim blocks covering an area of 18,350 ha. Claims are either registered to Search Minerals or to Alterra Resources Inc. (Alterra), a wholly owned subsidiary of Search Minerals. No surface rights for construction or quarrying are known to exist. At the time of writing, all claims are held in good standing. Licence details and statistics are summarized in Table 4-1.

TABLE 4-1 SUMMARY OF LICENCE AND CLAIM BLOCK STATISTICS
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

License Number	Number of Claims	Area (ha)	Issuance Date	Renewal Date	Next Work Due	Expenditures Required
016939M	43	1.075	12/21/09	12/21/14	12/21/13	\$7,348.07
016940M	30	750	12/21/09	12/21/14	12/21/12	\$9,475.03
016941M	57	1.425	12/21/09	12/21/14	12/21/13	\$6,579.84
016942M	25	625	12/21/09	12/21/14	12/21/12	\$9,939.84
016943M	73	1.825	12/21/09	12/22/14	12/22/13	\$18,326.84
016944M	24	600	12/22/09	12/22/14	12/22/21	\$21,600.00
016949M	53	1.325	12/24/09	12/24/14	12/24/21	\$47,700.00
016950M	3	75	12/24/09	12/24/14	12/24/17	\$1,405.76
016951M	14	350	12/24/09	12/24/14	12/24/13	\$640.71
016955M	52	1.300	12/28/09	12/28/14	12/28/21	\$46,800.00
016956M	2	50	12/28/09	12/28/14	12/28/15	\$471.57
016957M	22	550	12/28/09	12/28/14	12/28/13	\$3,247.67
017869M	37	925	08/04/10	08/04/15	08/04/14	\$2,879.18
016480M	4	100	09/17/09	09/17/14	09/17/15	\$2,376.62
016620M	26	650	11/02/09	11/02/14	11/02/13	\$1,334.03
017646M	18	450	05/15/10	05/14/15	05/14/16	\$1,239.14
019367M	62	1.550	09/28/11	09/28/16	09/28/13	\$59.40
019368M	2	50	09/28/11	09/28/16	09/28/14	\$140.20
019369M	62	1.550	09/28/11	09/28/16	09/28/13	\$355.83
019370M	125	3.125	09/28/11	09/28/16	09/28/13	\$5,445.64
TOTAL	734	18.350				\$187,365.37

ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS AND PERMITTING

Permits must be obtained for drilling, trenching, and water use. Activities that only require notification include geology, prospecting, ground geophysics, and all forms of geochemistry and line cutting. Applications for permits and notifications are submitted to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, Department of Natural Resources, Mines Branch, Mineral Lands Division.

Search Minerals was fully permitted to conduct all work performed during the 2010 and 2011 exploration programs and remains fully permitted to conduct all current work being done.

5 ACCESSIBILITY, CLIMATE, LOCAL RESOURCES, INFRASTRUCTURE AND PHYSIOGRAPHY

ACCESSIBILITY

The Foxtrot Project is located approximately 36 km east southeast of Port Hope Simpson, and approximately 10 km west northwest of St. Lewis, Labrador. The majority of the property is accessible via Highway 513, which is an all season gravel highway. Properties not adjacent to the roadside are within walking distance. Diamond drill hole locations on licenses 016955M, 016944M and 016949M are located up to approximately 0.5 km from the adjacent Highway 513.

Travel to the mine site from Goose Bay is available via charter plane, helicopter and road. Goose Bay is a preferred hub as it is regularly serviced from eastern Canadian cities including Quebec City and Montreal, Quebec and Halifax, Nova Scotia. Flight time from the exploration site to Goose Bay by helicopter is approximately two hours, and by plane approximately one hour. Road travel from Goose Bay to mine site is approximately six hours.

CLIMATE

Port Hope Simpson is subject to a maritime climate. During the six month field season, temperatures range from an average low of -1 °C in May, to an average high of 18 °C in July and August. Over the same time period, average monthly precipitation ranges from 64 mm in May, to 92 mm in June. Average monthly snowfall in May and June are 8 cm and 3 cm, respectively; snow is not expected in the remaining months of the field season. Drilling activities can occur all year around due to relatively mild winters.

LOCAL RESOURCES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The nearby communities of Port Hope Simpson, St. Lewis and Mary's Harbour have port access as well as airstrips that can facilitate transportation of goods required for exploration programs. St. Lewis has deep water dock facilities and a small gravel airstrip suitable for small aircraft. Port Hope Simpson, St. Lewis, and Mary's Harbour, which have populations of

approximately 500, 300, and 400 respectively, have various services including grocery stores, hardware stores, hotels and, heavy equipment for rent and labourers for hire.

There is no electricity available on the Project site. The closest source is diesel generated electricity in the town of St. Lewis, 8 km away.

Water sources are plentiful at the Property.

PHYSIOGRAPHY

Elevation ranges from sea level to approximately 100 m. Topography is rugged with generally east-west striking ridges and hills with low lying areas containing rivers, ponds and brooks that generally drain east into St. Lewis Inlet. As an ecoregion, the property can be classified as 'Coastal Barrens' with the majority of the property being scrubland. Vegetation consists of isolated black and white spruce stands in sheltered valleys, mosses, lichens and Labrador tea in more barren areas and lichen-covered bedrock in higher areas and along ridges.

6 HISTORY

Search Minerals began actively trading on the TSX Venture Exchange under the symbol SMY after it successfully acquired all outstanding shares of Alterra, now a wholly-owned subsidiary. Alterra holds approximately 4,000 mineral claims including claims in the Port Hope Simpson (PHS) REE district. Search Minerals began extensive exploration in the district in 2009 after it entered into a binding letter of intent to acquire an undivided 100% interest in certain claims in southeast Labrador owned by B and A Minerals Inc. known as the Port Hope Simpson property. Subsequent staking acquired adjacent land, including the Fox Harbour property and the Foxtrot Project.

There are no historical resource or reserves estimates on the Foxtrot Project.

There is no past production on the Foxtrot Project.

7 GEOLOGICAL SETTING AND MINERALIZATION

REGIONAL GEOLOGY

The Foxtrot Project occurs adjacent and within the boundaries of three tectonic terranes within the eastern Grenville Province, Labrador. Terranes include the Lake Melville terrane, Mealy Mountain terrane and the Pinware terrane, from north to south, respectively. Differing lithologies, structures and metamorphic signatures distinguish these terranes from one another; they are largely separated and defined by major fault zones (Gower et al., 1987, 1988; Gower, 2010; Hanmer and Scott, 1990).


The Foxtrot Project is located adjacent to the south of the Lake Melville terrane, also referred to as the Gilbert River Belt, to the southeast. This terrane is characterized by the Alexis River anorthosite, biotite-bearing granite, granodiorite and quartz diorite to diorite gneiss (Gower et al., 1987, 1988; Gower 2010; Hanmer and Scott, 1990). The Fox Harbour fault zone is thought to separate the Lake Melville terrane from the Pinware terrane to the south.

The Mealy Mountain terrane occurs to the northwest of the Foxtrot Project. This terrane contains mostly biotite granitic gneiss, potassium feldspar megacrystic granite gneiss, quartz diorite to dioritic gneisses and pelitic to semipelitic sedimentary gneisses (Gower et al., 1987, 1988; Gower, 2010).

The Pinware domain, in the St. Lewis Inlet area, consists of metamorphosed felsic to intermediate intrusions and older intercalated quartzo-feldspathic supracrustal rocks. Intrusions consist mainly of granite, k-feldspar megacrystic granite, quartz monzonite, granodiorite and supracrustal rocks consisting mainly of felsic volcanic rocks and arenitic sediments (Gower, 2007, 2010).

Granitic pegmatites cut most units in the region, but are largely absent from the Fox Harbour area.

Figure 7-1 presents the Foxtrot Project regional geology.



Early Cambrian

Bradore Formation

Post-Grenvillian

Monzonite, syenite, granite

Pre-Grenvillian - Post-Pinwarian

Quartz diorite, hornblende granodiorite

Syenite, granite

Gabbro-anorthosite

Pinwarian

Post-Labradorian supracrustal rocks

Granite, syenite

Syenite, monzonite, anorthosite

Syenite, monzonite, diorite

Labradorian

Granite, granodiorite

Granite

K-feldspar megacrystic granitoid rocks; quartz diorite, hornblende granodiorite, orthogneiss

Gabbro-norite

Anorthosite

Metasedimentary gneiss

Source: Search Minerals Inc., 2012.

Figure 7-1

Search Minerals Inc.

Foxtrot Project

Port Hope Simpson Area,
Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada
Regional Geology

LOCAL GEOLOGY


The Foxtrot Project contains three extensive east-west to northwest trending volcanic belts (Road Belt, Mt Belt, and South Belt), extending upwards of 30 km in length, and approximately 50 m to 500 m in width (Figure 7-2). These volcanic belts are largely bound by megacrystic granitic augen gneiss, which is variably mylonitized at contacts. The Foxtrot Project is located within the central volcanic belt (Mt Belt). These volcanic belts are interpreted to be bi-modal mafic and felsic volcanics, with intercalated volcaniclastic units located largely at contacts and within the mafic volcanics. Mafic volcanics contain large epidote pods, up to one metre by 0.5 m in length and width, along with differential weathering of individual layers, indicating a volcanic protolith. The felsic volcanics have very consistent stratigraphy that can be followed based on the stratigraphic contacts, indicative weathering, mineralogy, geochemistry, magnetic susceptibility, aeromagnetic survey, and ground-based magnetic survey.

Figure 7-2

Search Minerals Inc.

Foxtrot Project
Port Hope Simpson Area,
Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada
Local Geology


December 2012 Source: Search Minerals Inc., 2012.



PROPERTY GEOLOGY

All phases of drilling targeted the Mt Belt (Figure 7-2), a zone of inter-layered bands of mafic and felsic volcanic rocks that lies between a mafic gneiss to the south and an augen gneiss to the north. As shown in Figure 7-3, this belt is predominantly felsic, with thinner bands of mafic volcanics tending to separate thicker bands of felsic volcanic.

All of the currently discovered mineralization with economic potential lies in the felsic bands of the Mt Belt, with the highest grades lying in a continuous band that has been locally designated as the FT3 by Search Minerals geologists. Other continuous and semi-continuous bands of felsic rocks, such as the FT2, FT2x, FT3b, FT4, and FT5, contain REE mineralization that is either lower in grade or more spatially erratic/thinner.



RARE EARTH MINERALIZATION

The Fox Harbour bi-modal felsic and mafic volcanic package is host to REE mineralization. The Foxtrot Project is the thickest explored occurrence of these volcanic rocks in the Fox Harbour area. Mineralization in the Foxtrot Project is largely allanite, zircon, chevkinite, and fergusonite. Higher-grade mineralization occurs within specific volcanic packages that can be followed for tens of kilometres. These high-grade zones are characterized by a dark groundmass, consisting of the mineral assemblage that includes all or some of the following minerals: magnetite, pyroxene, amphibole, amazonite, and biotite.

8 DEPOSIT TYPES

The Foxtrot Project REE deposit type has not been previously described. It is not peralkaline in nature but is closely related to that deposit type as described below by the Newfoundland and Labrador Geological Survey Mineral Commodity Series (2011):

Rare-earth elements and rare-metal deposits in peralkaline suites define two end-member-types that are respectively dominated by magmatic and metasomatic–hydrothermal processes, but many deposits exhibit evidence for both processes. In magmatic examples, the ore minerals are dispersed as essential components of igneous rocks, notably in pegmatites and aplites, and hydrothermal alteration is limited. The host rocks may be either of plutonic or volcanic origin, although the former are more common. In metasomatic–hydrothermal examples, mineralization is superimposed on pre-existing rock units (which may be of peralkaline affinity) reflecting the transfer of metals in magmatic hydrothermal fluids to form replacement zones or vein systems. In such deposits, hydrothermal alteration is more widespread. Both processes operate together and a complex continuum of mineralization styles may occur. However, the REE and related metals are all incompatible trace elements that are concentrated by magmatic fractionation in peralkaline magmas, and this process appears to be fundamental to deposit genesis.

Rare-earth elements and rare-metal deposits may include a wide variety of uncommon minerals in addition to better-known minerals such as zircon, allanite, titanite, monazite and xenotime. The mineralogy of these deposits is a critical factor in their economic evaluation, as some REE-bearing minerals are highly resistant to chemical solvent extraction processes. In many cases, custom-process design is required to successfully extract the desired commodities from ore, and from each other.

9 EXPLORATION

Search Minerals began exploration on the Fox Harbour property within the PHS in the winter of 2009, conducting an Aeroquest airborne radiometric and magnetometer survey (Figures 9-1, 9-2 and 9-3). Following this survey, anomalous areas of interest were outlined, prioritized and ground-checked during the start of the 2010 field season. Within the Fox Harbour property, the Foxtrot Project was the highest priority target due to its elevated radiometric and magnetometer values. Exploration in 2010 consisted of prospecting, mapping, lithogeochemical grab sampling, clearing, hand trenching, channel sampling with a portable circular saw and diamond drilling. This exploration program was conducted across the entire Fox Harbour volcanic belt, with the main area of focus being the Foxtrot Project.

Search Minerals commenced a Phase I exploration drill program at Foxtrot Project in Q4 2010. The Phase I drill program consisted of 23 diamond drill holes (DDH) totalling 3,876 m to a depth of 100 m and along two kilometres of strike. A Phase II exploration drill program was completed in Q3 2011 and consisted of 20 DDHs totalling 4,083 m to a depth of 200 m along a 500 m strike.

A Phase III exploration drill program was completed in Q1 2012 and consisted of 29 DDHs totalling 10,896 m to a depth of 450 m along a 600 m strike. The drilling area focused on the thicker portion of FT3 which is approximately 10 m to 25 m in true width.

The Mineral Resource estimate in this report is based on data from Phases I, II, and III.

Figure 9-1

Search Minerals Inc.

Foxtrot Project
Port Hope Simpson Area,
Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada
Magnetic Survey

Source: Search Minerals Inc., 2012.
December 2012

9-2




Figure 9-2

Search Minerals Inc.

Foxtrot Project
 Port Hope Simpson Area,
 Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada
Thorium Survey

Source: Search Minerals Inc., 2012.
 December 2012

9-3





Figure 9-3

Search Minerals Inc.

Foxtrot Project
Port Hope Simpson Area,
Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada
Uranium Survey

Source: Search Minerals Inc., 2012.
December 2012

9-4



EXPLORATION POTENTIAL

Exploration in the Fox Harbour volcanic belt and in particular the Foxtrot Project area revealed highly anomalous REE mineralization associated with magnetic/radiometric anomalies in felsic volcanic rocks. The Phase I exploration drill program intersected mineralization in all holes along a two kilometre strike length. The Phase II and Phase III exploration drill programs were focused on a 500 m zone that showed the highest grades and thickest mineralized units. All holes drilled to date have intersected the mineralized units.

Potential to expand the resource exists both at depth and along strike. Including the drill results from Phase III, the mineralization is open at depth and poorly known along strike outside the 500 m zone. The next exploration priority at the Foxtrot Project is to drill along strike and at depth to define the extent of the mineralization and improve quality and size of the Mineral Resource estimate.

10 DRILLING

DRILLING BY SEARCH MINERALS

Springdale Forest Resources of Springdale, Newfoundland, was awarded the contract to complete the 3,876 m drill program in the late fall of 2010 and early winter of 2011. An excavator assisted with the drill moves for this program, and a Muskeg tractor transported the drillers, fuel, and core.

Logan Drilling Group of Stewiacke, Nova Scotia was awarded the contract to complete the Phase II drill program totalling 4,083 m in the summer of 2011. A skidder was used in transporting and moving the drill, along with fuel, and core.

Springdale Forest Resources was awarded the contract to complete the Phase III drill program, totalling 10,896 m in the fall of 2011 and early winter of 2012. This drill program utilized two drills, one that was moved by skidder, and the second, which was mounted on a nodwell. The skidder was also used to transport fuel, propane, and core.

Drill hole collar positions were determined by Search Mineral's senior geological personnel and were located in the field by a Search Minerals geologist. Drill holes were initially plotted using ArcGIS, and collar positions staked using a handheld GPS unit. All drill holes in the Foxtrot Project were surveyed after drilling had been completed to within ± 0.60 m GPS positional accuracy, and 0.2° to 1.0° azimuth accuracy. Coordinates were recorded in UTM format according to the NAD83 datum, and elevations were recorded in meters above sea level.

All drill holes were drilled at an angle to the horizontal; the collar azimuth and dip were planned and checked by a Search Minerals geologist. The drill hole was set with an extended foresight from the drill head, and the azimuth of this line direction was measured with a Brunton or Silva type compass. The drill hole collar dip was set and measured with an inclinometer on the drill rods at the drill head.

No serious deviation problems have been encountered in the drilling to date, with most holes deviating less than 5° to 10° per 100 m from both azimuth and dip. Due to the steeply dipping mineralized zone, this did not affect true thickness calculations.

Sample length ranges from 0.05 m to 2.50 m, with the majority being exactly 1.0 m. The true thickness of the mineralization is a 100 m wide package of felsic and mafic bands.

Table 10-1 summarizes the drilling from all three phases.

Tables 10-2 and 10-3 presents significant intervals from drilling phases I and II for key rare earth metals and key rare earth oxides, respectively. Figure 10-1 displays the diamond drill hole locations from Phases I and II and Figure 10-2 displays diamond drill hole locations from Phase III.

TABLE 10-1 DRILL HOLE SUMMARY
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Hole_ID	Easting	Northing	RL (m)	Depth (m)	Dip	Azimuth	# of Samples	Assay Range	Work Order Numbers
FT-10-01	580888	5806100	64.5	149	-45.54	190.1	228	455001-455228	A10-8275
FT-10-02	580790	5806121	65.4	149	-45.33	190.1	236	455229-455464	A10-8794/8849
FT-10-03	580799	5806177	64.9	176	-44.90	195.4	289	455464-455752	A10-8849/9404
FT-10-04	580699	5806189	66.4	182	-46.23	197.6	242	455753-456044	A10-9405
FT-10-05	580591	5806219	53.2	224	-45.90	199.7	254	456045-456298	A10-9406/9433
FT-10-06	580570	5806169	57.1	125	-45.00	195.0	148	456299-456438	A10-9613
FT-10-07	580506	5806219	60.0	161	-45.18	197.6	186	456439-456624	A10-9614
FT-10-08	580410	5806247	68.1	137	-44.72	196.3	153	456625-456777	A11-0148/0149
FT-10-09	580340	5806329	68.8	218	-45.62	195.0	253	456778-457030	A11-0149/0208
FT-10-10	580326	5806273	68.3	167	-45.72	197.5	184	457031-457214	A11-0478
FT-10-11	580211	5806291	68.9	164	-42.68	194.7	198	457221-457418	A11-0303
FT-10-12	580119	5806313	69.5	158	-45.49	191.8	215	457419-457633	A11-0471
FT-10-13	580134	5806357	74.8	266	-45.62	190.6	352	457634-457985	A11-0558
FT-10-14	580025	5806349	73.2	161	-43.67	184.9	186	460001-460186	A11-0671
FT-10-15	579941	5806353	73.2	167	-45.09	195.6	180	457986-458165	A11-0670
FT-10-16	579842	5806379	72.0	152	-45.41	189.0	167	460187-460353	A11-0803
FT-10-17	579740	5806375	67.3	176	-44.10	187.2	220	458166-458385	A11-0773
FT-10-18	579644	5806407	71.8	202	-45.59	188.1	264	460354-460617	A11-0910
FT-11-01	579571	5806404.6	71.4	176	-44.752	190.11	215	458386-458600	A11-0778
FT-11-02	579483	5806411	71.6	173	-44.726	190.81	203	460618-460820	A11-0997
FT-11-03	581077	5806016.9	50.4	137	-44.824	191.16	152	458601-458752	A11-0909
FT-11-04	581272	5806004.6	55.9	110	-44.973	195.9	111	460821-460931	A11-0992
FT-11-05	581480	5805961.4	53.2	146	-46.201	196.12	165	458753-458917	A11-0995
FT-11-06	580716	5806251.4	60.8	277	-43.33	193.5	308	505501-505808	A11-4673/4691
FT-11-07	580748	5806176.6	67.2	180	-44.72	195	188	509001-501188	A11-5040/5047
FT-11-08	580628	5806152.9	63.6	127	-42.75	192.08	135	505809-505943	A11-4985/4986
FT-11-09	580647	5806202.9	62.3	181	-45.23	195	187	505944-506130	A11-5047/5048
FT-11-10	580601	5806269.4	57.3	249	-44.48	191.1	263	509189-509451	A11-5284/5370
FT-11-11	580535	5806180.6	54.6	124	-44.53	199.63	123	506131-506253	A11-5371/5446
FT-11-12	580554	5806229.4	58	206.9	-44.14	200.79	227	509452-509678	A11-5446/5448
FT-11-13	580497	5806170.6	59.6	115	-44.08	197.49	119	506254-506372	A11-5467/5468
FT-11-14	580521	5806267.8	61.2	230	-43.7	201.24	231	506373-506603	A11-5472/5473
FT-11-15	580466	5806250.6	63.7	193	-44.66	197.2	207	509679-509885	A11-5625/5627
FT-11-16	580390	5806174.6	64.2	100	-43.78	198.56	109	509886-509994	A11-5811/5829
FT-11-17	580421	5806295.8	68.2	211	-46.4	195.94	235	510125-510359	A11-6033/6037
FT-11-18	580361	5806224	64.2	118	-43.6	190.5	130	509995-510124	A11-5808/5830


Hole_ID	Easting	Northing	RL (m)	Depth (m)	Dip	Azimuth	# of Samples	Assay Range	Work Order Numbers
FT-11-19	580375	5806284.4	68.4	226	-44.69	195.92	242	510680-510921	A11-6671/6472
FT-11-20	580453	5806198.4	61.5	130	-44.36	195.66	141	510922-511062	A11-6645/6648
FT-11-21	580722	5806300.8	51.3	304	-44.25	192.5	320	510360-510679	A11-6325/6548
FT-11-22	580662	5806254.4	52.9	253	-42.72	195	260	511332-511591	A11-6958/6959
FT-11-23	580813	5806230.4	59.4	259	-43.609	195.97	269	511053-511331	A11-6859/6850
FT-11-24	580762	5806229.6	64.3	250	-44.19	196.47	257	511592-511848	A11-6959/6963
FT-11-25	580777	5806285.6	52.7	331	-43.03	198.1	334	506604-506937	A11-6960/6963
FT-11-26	580827	5806272	49.8	302	-44.99	192.7	164	512001-512164	A11-11763/11764
FT-11-27	580880	5806261	45.3	299	-44.91	193.3	141	550001-550141	A11-12119/12120
FT-11-28	580838	5806328	47.0	355	-44.74	195.2	145	553001-553145	A11-12121/12122
FT-11-29	580855	5806390	46.0	413	-45.47	195.9	200	550142-550341	A11-12276
FT-11-30	580881	5806440	43.7	478	-45.63	194.1	222	553146-553367	A11-12490
FT-11-31	580518	5806276	63.0	226	-45.45	195.1	155	550342-550496	A11-12492
FT-11-32	580567	5806286	61.1	247	-46.38	195.5	148	550497-550644	A11-12586
FT-11-33	580886	5806494	37.5	538	-45.64	198.2	240	553368-553607	A11-13023/13035
FT-11-34	580617	5806326	58.6	301	-44.36	195.2	211	550645-550855	A11-12801/12804
FT-11-35	580665	5806316	52.0	302	-44.99	193.6	169	550856-551024	A11-13042/13043
FT-11-36	580744	5806356	51.2	350	-45.68	193.3	143	551025-551167	A11-13227/13228
FT-11-37	580986	5806474	30.7	565	-45.56	200.2	234	553608-553841	A11-13499/13500
FT-11-38	580635	5806383	50.1	360	-46.86	195.1	165	551168-551332	A11-13412/13413
FT-11-39	580647	5806437	50.8	415	-45.57	195.3	164	551333-551496	A11-13821/13822
FT-11-40	580970	5806416	32.6	469	-44.29	195.0	202	553842-554043	A11-13913/13914
FT-11-41	580756	5806402	47.0	421	-45.44	193.7	179	551497-551675	A11-14071/14072
FT-11-42	581076	5806380	29.4	469	-44.69	195.0	238	554044-554281	A11-14424
FT-11-43	580773	5806467	50.1	472	-44.65	195.5	251	551676-551926	A11-14425
FT-11-44A	581080	5806440	31.4	550	-45.65	196.1	217	554282-554498	A11-14794
FT-11-45	580940	5806300	41.0	358	-45.38	196.5	135	551940-552074	A11-14994
FT-11-46	580957	5806354	46.0	410	-46.53	195.2	166	552075-552240	A12-00340
FT-11-47	580787	5806517	40.0	514	-44.10	198.5	197	554499-554695	A12-00412
FT-11-48	580589	5806339	56.9	310	-47.62	193.8	137	552241-552377	A12-00340
FT-12-01	580531	5806343	57.7	299	-43.77	194.1	135	554696-554830	A12-00477
FT-12-02	580904	5806609	30.3	649	-45.81	198.4	378	554831-555208	A12-00799
FT-12-03	580666	5806150	66.1	122	-44.68	194.7	130	552378-552507	A12-00902
FT-12-04	580665	5806150	66.3	104	-45.35	196.0	108	555209-555316	A12-01031
FT-12-05	580496	5806368	60.2	299	-45.48	197.2	127	555317-555443	A12-01032
FT-12-06	580440	5806384	62.4	299	-45.64	196.6	135	555444-555578	A12-01145

TABLE 10-2 SIGNIFICANT INTERVALS, AVERAGES FOR KEY METALS
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project




Hole	Length (m)	From (m)	To (m)	Dy (ppm)	Nd (ppm)	Y (ppm)	HREE+Y (%)	TREE+Y (%)
FT-10-04	21.2	123.5	144.7	215	1,639	1,210	0.20	0.99
FT-10-05	11.5	126.4	137.9	217	1,721	1,211	0.20	1.01
FT-10-06	9.9	63	72.9	233	1,795	1,296	0.22	1.09
FT-10-07	12.9	108.3	121.3	203	1,635	1,151	0.19	1.03
FT-10-08	7.6	90.3	97.8	245	1,766	1,312	0.22	1.04
FT-10-11	8.5	96.8	105.3	202	1,756	1,188	0.19	1.09
FT-11-06	21.4	196.9	218.3	221	1,733	1,177	0.20	1.03
FT-11-07	11.5	127.2	138.7	208	1,454	1,141	0.19	0.90
FT-11-08	14.9	60.7	75.6	234	1,647	1,254	0.21	1.02
FT-11-09	25	124.6	149.6	207	1,691	1,149	0.19	1.04
FT-11-10	30.2	181.1	211.3	201	1,507	1,066	0.18	0.92
FT-11-11	18.7	73.6	92.3	230	1,799	1,350	0.22	1.11
FT-11-12	10.3	137	147.3	204	1,729	1,160	0.19	1.06
FT-11-13	24.2	46.3	70.5	212	1,647	1,251	0.20	1.07
FT-11-14	10.8	167.8	178.6	206	1,803	1,222	0.20	1.13
FT-11-16	7.5	21.9	29.4	230	1,921	1,306	0.22	1.17
FT-11-17	10	148	158	228	1,577	1,159	0.20	0.97
FT-11-20	7.1	70.3	77.4	235	1,862	1,330	0.22	1.18
FT-11-21	12	250.7	262.7	240	1,897	1,342	0.22	1.14
FT-11-22	17	179.3	196.3	235	1,786	1,379	0.22	1.11
FT-11-23	15.8	196.6	212.3	212	1,642	1,178	0.20	0.98
FT-11-24	15.1	189.2	204.3	212	1,595	1,141	0.19	0.97
FT-11-25	26.1	243.6	269.6	205	1,526	1,200	0.20	0.95

TABLE 10-3 SIGNIFICANT INTERVALS, AVERAGES FOR KEY OXIDES
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Hole	Length (m)	From (m)	To (m)	Dy ₂ O ₃ (ppm)	Nd ₂ O ₃ (ppm)	Y ₂ O ₃ (ppm)	HREO+Y (%)	TREO+Y (%)
FT-10-04	21.2	123.5	144.7	248	1,918	1,536	0.24	1.19
FT-10-05	11.5	126.4	137.9	249	2,014	1,538	0.24	1.22
FT-10-06	9.9	63	72.9	268	2,100	1,646	0.26	1.32
FT-10-07	12.9	108.3	121.3	234	1,913	1,461	0.23	1.24
FT-10-08	7.6	90.3	97.8	281	2,066	1,666	0.27	1.25
FT-10-11	8.5	96.8	105.3	232	2,055	1,508	0.24	1.31
FT-11-06	21.4	196.9	218.3	254	2,027	1,495	0.24	1.24
FT-11-07	11.5	127.2	138.7	239	1,701	1,450	0.23	1.08
FT-11-08	14.9	60.7	75.6	269	1,927	1,592	0.26	1.22
FT-11-09	25	124.6	149.6	238	1,978	1,460	0.23	1.25
FT-11-10	30.2	181.1	211.3	231	1,763	1,354	0.22	1.11
FT-11-11	18.7	73.6	92.3	264	2,105	1,714	0.27	1.34
FT-11-12	10.3	137	147.3	235	2,023	1,473	0.23	1.27
FT-11-13	24.2	46.3	70.5	244	1,927	1,589	0.25	1.28
FT-11-14	10.8	167.8	178.6	237	2,110	1,552	0.24	1.36
FT-11-16	7.5	21.9	29.4	265	2,248	1,659	0.26	1.41
FT-11-17	10	148	158	263	1,846	1,471	0.24	1.16
FT-11-20	7.1	70.3	77.4	270	2,179	1,689	0.27	1.42
FT-11-21	12	250.7	262.7	276	2,220	1,704	0.27	1.37
FT-11-22	17	179.3	196.3	270	2,089	1,751	0.27	1.33
FT-11-23	15.8	196.6	212.3	244	1,921	1,496	0.24	1.18
FT-11-24	15.1	189.2	204.3	244	1,866	1,450	0.24	1.17
FT-11-25	26.1	243.6	269.6	236	1,786	1,524	0.24	1.14



Legend:

-  Drill Hole & Number
-  Channel
-  Section Line

December 2012

Source: Search Minerals Inc., 2012.

Figure 10-1

Search Minerals Inc.

Foxtrot Project

Port Hope Simpson Area,
Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada

Drill Hole Locations Phase I & II

Channels and Section Lines



5,806,600
5,806,400
5,806,200

5,806,600
5,806,400
5,806,200

580,400 580,600 580,800 581,000




Figure 10-2

Phase:

- Phase 1: Fall 2010 - Winter 2011
- Phase 2: Summer 2011
- Phase 3: Fall 2011 - Winter 2012

Search Minerals Inc.

Foxtrot Project

*Port Hope Simpson Area,
Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada*

Drill Hole Locations Phase III

580,400

0 50 100 150 200

Metres

December 2012

11 SAMPLE PREPARATION, ANALYSES AND SECURITY

The two sampling methods used at the Foxtrot Project during the 2010 and 2011 sampling programs were diamond drilling and channel sampling. All sample preparation and core logging were done at the field house, which is located in Port Hope Simpson, approximately 45 minutes by truck from the Foxtrot Project field area. Drilling, core logging, and sampling operations were supervised by Randy Miller, P.Geo., VP of Exploration for Search Minerals.

All drilling, logging, and sampling procedures were reviewed by Benchmark Six and RPA during their site visit. The quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) protocols, procedures for ensuring the security of drill core and channel samples, integrity of chain-of-custody for samples, and accuracy of laboratory analyses all met normal industry practices.

DIAMOND DRILL CORE

Diamond drill core was placed into standard wooden core boxes and stacked at the drill site. Core boxes were transported by pick-up truck from the field area to the field house at least once a day where they were organized onto racks in the core shed. Geologists log the core and mark assay sample intervals with wax crayon. Intervals averaged one metre but were longer or shorter, at the discretion of the geologist, depending on the structural and lithological features present. Drill core was logged manually and the logs were subsequently entered into a digital database by Search Minerals staff. All original paper drill logs are kept on file.

The core was split by technicians according to the marked assay intervals; all splitting was done using a circular saw with a diamond tip blade. One half of the core was placed in a sample bag and sent to the lab for chemical analyses and the other half remains in the core box for future reference. For each interval, one sample tag was placed in the sample bag and another sample tag was stapled to the bottom of the core box, under the core. After the core had been split and sampled, the remaining core was placed back into core boxes and kept in the core shed. All stored core boxes are affixed with an aluminum plate indicating the hole ID and the interval contained within. A list was made of all sample numbers and their corresponding hole ID, and from-to depths.

The drill rig used during the 2010 sampling program was a Dura-lite 500 and was operated by Springdale Forest Resources. The 2011 sampling program made use of two different drill rigs: a Longyear Super 38 that was fully enclosed and mounted on skids as well as a Longyear Fly 38 that was not enclosed, also mounted on skids and was suitable to be moved by helicopter. These two drill rigs were operated by Logan Drilling Group. All core drilled during the 2010 and 2011 sampling programs was NQ size.

CHANNEL SAMPLES

Channel samples were taken from surface outcrop, perpendicular to the strike of the mineralization. A circular saw with a diamond tip blade was used to cut the rock into approximately 3-cm thick by 6-cm wide slabs that were then put into channel boxes and transported back to the field house. These samples were logged, cut, and sampled according to the same procedure as the diamond drill core, described above.

SAMPLE ANALYSES

Sample bags were transported by Search Minerals staff to Activation Laboratories (Actlabs) in Goose Bay, Labrador, where they were crushed to a minus 10 mesh, riffle split to obtain a representative sample, pulverized to at least 95% passing minus 150 mesh and then sent to Actlabs' Ancaster, Ontario location for analysis. Samples were analyzed using a lithium metaborate/tetraborate fusion with subsequent analysis by inductively coupled plasma (ICP) and ICP/MS (mass spectroscopy).

Actlabs is an independent lab accredited according to both the ISO 17025 standard for testing and calibration laboratories, and the CAN-P-1579 standard, specific to mineral analysis laboratories. In 2007, Actlabs became accredited to NELAP, an American laboratory accreditation program specifically for the environmental sector.

QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY CONTROL


ACTLABS INTERNAL QA/QC

The resource estimate included in this report incorporates analytical results from 69 batches that were submitted to Actlabs between November 2010 and August 2011. With each batch, Actlabs used three types of samples to monitor the accuracy and precision of their results: standards, blanks, and duplicates.

The standards allow the lab to monitor the accuracy of their results. There were a total of 22 different standards that were used to test the accuracy of the REE data and no one standard alone covered the complete set of potentially economic elements.

Among the economically viable elements, dysprosium is one of the more important heavy REEs and neodymium is one of the more important light REEs. Figure 11-1 shows the percent error of the dysprosium and neodymium in the various standards according to date of the analysis, a proxy commonly used for batch.

FIGURE 11-1 SELECTED RESULTS FOR ACTLABS' INTERNAL QUALITY CONTROL CHART FOR STANDARDS



In all 69 batches, 97.2% of internal standards fall with $\pm 10\%$ error of the original sample when the dysprosium and neodymium data are isolated. While this is generally accepted as a good result, it is recommended that closer attention be paid to the labs internal standards, and batches that do not meet pre-set protocols should be re-assayed.


Blank control samples allow the lab to monitor cross contamination between the samples. While contamination can occur during the sample preparation and the analysis stage, these blank control samples were limited to monitoring only the analysis stage.

It is normal industry practice to reject any batch whose results are more than five times the detection limit. Although Search Minerals does not have any response protocol in place, of

the 104 blanks tested, no blank control sample had more than twice the detection limit. In RPA's opinion, cross contamination was not an issue at the Foxtrot Project.

Duplicates allow the lab to monitor precision of their analytical results. As with standards, it is normal industry practice to accept batches if 95% of duplicate samples fall within $\pm 10\%$ of their average. Although Search Minerals does not have any response protocol in place, in all 69 batches 98.8% of internal duplicate assays for dysprosium and neodymium fall within the $\pm 10\%$ band. The following graph shows the percent difference of duplicate analyses for dysprosium and neodymium.

FIGURE 11-2 SELECTED RESULTS OF ACTLABS' INTERNAL QUALITY CONTROL FOR DUPLICATES



SEARCH MINERALS EXTERNAL QA/QC

In addition to Actlabs' internal QA/QC efforts, the reliability of the analytical data was also monitored by Search Mineral's own external QA/QC program, using only standards and duplicates.


Search Minerals used two "ore"-grade standards and one standard chosen to effectively act as a blank. The two "ore"-grade standards include one from a eudialyte-rich zone in one of Search Minerals' other REE projects in Labrador, a peralkaline complex known as 'Red Wine' (RW), and one from a mineralized felsic volcanic gneiss unit found in Fox Harbour (FHG). The third standard, the very low grade standard, is from an anorthosite unit also found in Port Hope Simpson area (FHA).

The material for each standard was delivered to Actlabs in bulk and they were instructed to crush, pulverize, homogenize, store and insert pulp samples into the sample sequence during sample preparation. Throughout the 2010 drilling program, laboratory staff inserted one pulp standard every 50 samples but this procedure was changed in 2011 to include at least one standard with every batch to account for smaller batches of less than 50 samples where standards were previously not being included.

Rather than using certified reference material, Search Minerals used material sourced locally for which no certified value had been established by round-robin analyses from multiple laboratories. In this case, the average of all available results was used as the reference value and percent error was calculated.

The vast majority of results for the RW and FHG standards plot within the $\pm 10\%$ range. The results for FHA, the very low-grade standard, were not within $\pm 10\%$ of the average value but rather ranged from -50% to 150%, which is an acceptable range for a blank control sample. Due to the nature of the sample used, the values for each of the elements were very close to detection limit. The following graph shows the percent error of dysprosium and neodymium for the RW and FHG standards only.


FIGURE 11-3 SELECTED RESULTS FOR SEARCH MINERAL'S EXTERNAL QUALITY CONTROL FOR STANDARDS.



Search Mineral's implementation of duplicate samples as part of their QA/QC program was similar to that of the standards. Actlabs was instructed to duplicate every 25th sample and report the results as the original sample number appended with a 'B' in the Certificate of Analysis.

In all, there were 167 samples duplicated in the 69 batches. Of these, only six samples, or less than 4%, did not fall within a $\pm 10\%$ band. The following graph shows the percent difference of dysprosium and neodymium of the sample duplicates.

FIGURE 11-4 SELECTED RESULTS FOR SEARCH MINERAL'S EXTERNAL QUALITY CONTROL FOR DUPLICATES



PHASE III QA/QC

The third drilling campaign at Foxtrot used a QA/QC program similar to the one described above for Phases I and II. In addition to the internal QA/QC checks performed by Actlabs, Search Minerals included reference material in most batches. Three batches of reference material were used, and all three are usually submitted together. One essentially functioned as a blank, with very low REE concentrations (Dy<1 ppm, Nd<10 ppm). The other two served as material that enabled monitoring of the lab's ability to accurately assay samples with strong REE mineralization. One of these has Dy grades of approximately 300 ppm, and Nd grades of approximately 2,400 ppm; the other has Dy grades of approximately 700 ppm and Nd grades of approximately 2,000 ppm. Although there was no pre-established reference

value for these external reference materials, they do document that the lab is able to stay within $\pm 10\%$ of the average grade.

The external reference material had Dy and Nd grades that are higher than typical mineralization at Foxtrot, where most of the strong mineralization is 200 ppm to 250 ppm Dy and 1,000 ppm to 2,000 ppm Nd. RPA recommends that in future drilling programs, it would be useful to obtain a certified reference material for which the grade has been established prior to its use. This would help to confirm that there is no systematic bias at the lab. It is also recommended that the external reference materials have Dy grades similar to those encountered at Foxtrot: one reference material with approximately 150 ppm Dy and 1,000 ppm Nd; and another with approximately 250 ppm Dy and 2,000 ppm Nd.

The QA/QC program for the Phase III samples also included duplicate samples submitted externally by Search Minerals' geologists, typically one or two in each batch of samples submitted to the lab. These duplicates confirm the precision of the lab's analytical results. More than 90% of the duplicates produced REE assays within $\pm 10\%$ of the original assay.

Although the QA/QC program could be improved, particularly with the use of certified reference material and with monthly review of the results, the internal and external QA/QC data for the Phase I through Phase III programs demonstrates that the assay data have the accuracy and precision required for producing reliable resource estimates.

SAMPLE SECURITY

Search Minerals employs strict security protocols with the handling of their samples. Core is transported by truck only, both from the drill site to the field house and from the field house to the lab in Goose Bay. The core is stored in the core shack, a detached structure with doors and locks, and is organized carefully facilitating accessibility to all holes. During logging, cutting, and sampling, drill core is always under the supervision of full-time Search Minerals staff.

In the opinion of RPA, the procedures and protocols for sampling, sample preparation, analysis and security are all good, always at least as sound as the procedures used elsewhere and, in some aspects, at the level of industry best practice.

12 DATA VERIFICATION

RPA reviewed the resource database that formed the basis for the Resource Estimate presented in this Technical Report. This includes results from the QA/QC program and assay certificates for drill hole samples to a cut-off date of September 30, 2011. In the opinion of RPA no limitations on or failure to conduct data verifications occurred.

SITE VISIT

A site visit was conducted by Jacques Gauthier, Principal Mining Engineer for RPA, and Rick Breger, Director of Operations for Benchmark Six Inc., on October 27, 2011. While on site, both the field office and the Property were visited.

The site visit consisted of a complete tour of the premises, including the field office, the core logging shack, the core cutting shack, and the core storage facilities. During the visit, logging, cutting and sampling procedures were observed first hand.

The Property visit included a tour of the Foxtrot Project. During the time of the visit, the drill on site was being repaired so no drilling was observed. The Property visit included first hand observations of surface mineralization, including the location of the trenching, and old drill hole collars, specifically FT-10-04, FT-11-10, FT-11-25, and FT-11-31. All old collars are well marked with drill casing and capped with an aluminum tag marked with the hole ID. In addition, the power station and a port that could potentially service the Property were observed.

Both RPA and Benchmark Six concluded that Search Minerals staff conducted their exploration and drill activities to a standard that met or exceeded normal industry practices.

FIGURE 12-1 PHOTOGRAPH OF THE TRENCHING DONE DURING THE 2011 EXPLORATION PROGRAM



FIGURE 12-2 PHOTOGRAPH OF THE DRILL ON SITE



DATABASE VERIFICATION

Benchmark Six verified that the drill hole database matched the original Actlabs assay certificates. This was done by manually checking 10% of the data, across the range of low, medium and high-grade data according to dysprosium values.

No errors were found and RPA considers the database to be reliable and adequate for the purposes of resource estimation.

CHECK SAMPLES

During the site visit, RPA took 28 check samples. These samples were taken in order to check both the accuracy of the REE analyses performed by Actlabs and to determine the density of each lithological unit for use in the resource estimate. Of the check samples, 22 were used to check accuracy, and all 28 samples were used to determine density. Table 12-1 shows a detailed summary of the check samples analyzed by SGS, including the 22 drill core samples that were taken to check REE accuracy, for which there are dysprosium and neodymium grade comparisons shown, as well as the six channel samples that were taken for the purposes of determining the density of each lithological unit. The channel samples were not analyzed geochemically and the density of these samples is shown in Table 12-2.

TABLE 12-1 SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL AND CHECK SAMPLES
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Check Sample ID	Hole ID	Original Sample ID	Sample Type	Original Dy (ppm)	Check Dy (ppm)	Original Nd (ppm)	Check Nd (ppm)
MP-11-056	FT-11-12	509652	Drill Core	2.3	2.33	7.9	7.6
MP-11-057	FT-10-15	458142	Drill Core	3.4	3.04	8.9	7.2
MP-11-058	FT-10-17	458361	Drill Core	5.8	6.08	60.6	60.8
MP-11-059	FT-10-13	457844	Drill Core	4.7	4.38	15.9	13.5
MP-11-060	FT-10-02	455416	Drill Core	6.4	7.15	34.6	34.6
MP-11-061	FT-10-18	460354	Drill Core	7.2	6.44	68.4	61.4
MP-11-062	FT-10-09	456856	Drill Core	6.8	6.73	63.7	65
MP-11-063	FT-10-16	460326	Drill Core	8.7	8.71	39.8	37
MP-11-064	FT-10-02	455444	Drill Core	10	9.78	66.3	60.2
MP-11-065	FT-11-22	511521	Drill Core	264	236	1900	1700
MP-11-066	FT-10-06	456309	Drill Core	35.1	34.5	255	243
MP-11-067	FT-10-03	455669	Drill Core	25.6	30.6	127	177
MP-11-068	FT-11-04	460887	Drill Core	7.8	7.7	63.9	57.4
MP-11-069	FT-10-03	455679	Drill Core	40.5	72	241	457
MP-11-070	FT-10-07	456542	Drill Core	12.6	11.4	50.3	49.2
MP-11-071	FT-11-02	460679	Drill Core	360	360	464	419
MP-11-072	FT-11-19	510833	Drill Core	78.3	58.4	538	434
MP-11-073	FT-11-19	510834	Drill Core	198	190	1510	1460
MP-11-074	FT-10-10	457065	Drill Core	30.3	31.9	130	132
MP-11-075	FT-10-09	456941	Drill Core	50	52.8	294	296
MP-11-076	FT-10-09	456889	Drill Core	24.8	24.7	93.4	82.7
MP-11-077	FT-10-17	458242	Drill Core	130	106	440	353
MP-11-078	FTC-11-03	507719	Channel				
MP-11-079	FTC-11-03	507709	Channel				
MP-11-080	FTC-11-04	507818	Channel				
MP-11-081	FTC-11-27	507965	Channel				
MP-11-082	FTC-11-27	507967	Channel				
MP-11-083	FTC-11-04	507844	Channel				

The following table summarizes the results of the bulk density measurements done by SGS for the three lithological units found on the Foxtrot Project.

TABLE 12-2 SUMMARY OF BULK DENSITY CHECK SAMPLES
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Check Sample ID	Hole ID	Original Sample ID	Lithological Unit	Bulk Density (g/ml)
MP-11-056	FT-11-12	509652	Mafic	3.1
MP-11-057	FT-10-15	458142	Mafic	3.06
MP-11-058	FT-10-17	458361	Mafic	2.56
MP-11-059	FT-10-13	457844	Mafic	2.95
MP-11-060	FT-10-02	455416	Mafic	2.86
MP-11-061	FT-10-18	460354	Augen	2.67
MP-11-062	FT-10-09	456856	Augen	2.64
MP-11-063	FT-10-16	460326	Mafic	3.09
MP-11-064	FT-10-02	455444	Mafic	2.72
MP-11-065	FT-11-22	511521	Felsic	2.77
MP-11-066	FT-10-06	456309	Felsic	2.66
MP-11-067	FT-10-03	455669	Felsic	2.73
MP-11-068	FT-11-04	460887	Mafic	2.67
MP-11-069	FT-10-03	455679	Felsic	2.81
MP-11-070	FT-10-07	456542	Felsic	3.01
MP-11-071	FT-11-02	460679	Felsic	2.75
MP-11-072	FT-11-19	510833	Felsic	2.51
MP-11-073	FT-11-19	510834	Felsic	2.79
MP-11-074	FT-10-10	457065	Felsic	2.52
MP-11-075	FT-10-09	456941	Felsic	2.61
MP-11-076	FT-10-09	456889	Felsic	2.7
MP-11-077	FT-10-17	458242	Felsic	2.68
MP-11-078	FTC-11-03	507719	Augen	2.28
MP-11-079	FTC-11-03	507709	Mafic	2.84
MP-11-080	FTC-11-04	507818	Mafic	2.85
MP-11-081	FTC-11-27	507965	Augen	2.64
MP-11-082	FTC-11-27	507967	Mafic	3.01
MP-11-083	FTC-11-04	507844	Augen	2.41

INDEPENDENT THIRD PARTY QA/QC


As a further supplement to the quality control measures taken by both Actlabs and Search Minerals, Benchmark Six collected and submitted 30 samples to SGS in Toronto. This included 22 REE check samples, six density check samples, and two quality control samples. SGS uses a quality management system that meets, at a minimum, the requirements for both ISO 9001 and ISO 17025.

All samples were dried, measured for bulk density prior to being crushed and then pulverized. The REE and quality control check samples were analyzed according to method IMS95A – dissolved using lithium metaborate fusion and analyzed via ICP/MS. This method

was chosen because it replicated the process used by Actlabs. The two quality control samples were Search Minerals pulp standards FHA2 and FHG2. The results of the check samples are shown below in Figure 12-3. The density check samples were used to check the density of the three units at Foxtrot Project – the mineralized felsic material, the mafic material, and the augen gneiss.

The REE check samples were chosen according to the distribution of dysprosium seen on the property, ranging from 2.3 ppm to 360 ppm Dy. This allowed for a complete and thorough check of the low, medium, and high-grade material.

FIGURE 12-3 SELECTED RESULTS FROM THE 24 CHECK SAMPLES SUBMITTED TO SGS TORONTO



13 MINERAL PROCESSING AND METALLURGICAL TESTING

MINERALOGY STUDIES

A metallurgical sample obtained from a Foxtrot Project channel sample was submitted to SGS Minerals Services. The sample was stage crushed to K80 of 150 µm and then screened into two size fractions: +38µm and -38µm for the mineralogical study, and submitted for QEMSCANTM analysis.

The minerals identified in the sample are listed in Table 13-1.

TABLE 13-1 MINERAL LIST AND FORMULAS
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Mineral	Mineral Formula	Mineral	Mineral Formula
Columbite(Fe)	(Fe,Mn)(Nb,Ta) ₂ O ₆	Plagioclase	(NaSi,CaAl)AlSi ₂ O ₈
Bastnasite	(Ce, La)CO ₃ F	K-Feldspar	KAlSi ₃ O ₈
Synchysite	Ca(Ce,La)(CO ₃) ₂ F	Biotite	K(Mg,Fe) ₃ (AlSi ₃ O ₁₀)(OH) ₂
Monazite	(Ce,La,Pr,Nd,Th,Y)PO ₄	Quartz	SiO ₂
Chevkinite	(Ce,La,Ca,Th) ₄ (Fe ²⁺ ,Mg)(Fe ²⁺ ,Ti,Fe ³⁺)- (Ti,Fe ³⁺) ₂ (Si ₂ O ₇) ₂ O ₈	Muscovites/Clays	KAl ₂ (AlSi ₃ O ₁₀)(OH) ₂
Fergusonite	(Y,Er,Ce,Fe)NbO ₄	Amphibole/ Pyroxene	(Ca,Na)(Mg,Fe,Al,Ti)(Si,Al) ₂ O ₆
Allanite	(Ca,Ce) ₂ (Fe ²⁺ ,Fe ³⁺)Al ₂ O-(SiO ₄)(Si ₂ O ₇)(OH)	Carbonates	CaCO ₃
Zircon	ZrSiO ₄	Fluorite	CaF ₂
Apatite	(Ca,Ce,Y) ₅ (PO ₄ ,SiO ₄) ₃ (F,Cl,OH)	Hematite	Fe ₂ O ₃
		Ilmenite	FeTiO ₃
		Magnetite	Fe ₃ O ₄

MINERAL ABUNDANCE

Figure 13-1 illustrates the normalized mass % of the REE minerals (excluding zircon). It is apparent that allanite is the primary REE phase. The sample is dominated by quartz (35.8%) and K-feldspar (21.0%), moderate amounts of amphibole/pyroxene (13.7%), plagioclase (12.3%), minor Fe-oxides (4.4%), biotite (3.9%) and muscovite/clays (1.6%), and trace amounts of other silicates, carbonates, fluorite, other oxides and sulphides. REE-Zr minerals include mainly allanite (2.6%), zircon (2.5%), chevkinite (0.3%), fergusonite (0.2%), bastnasite/synchysite (0.1%), monazite (0.1%) and rare columbite. Most of the allanite (2.2%) occurs in the +38 µm, but most of zircon (1.5%) in the -38 µm fraction.

GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION

Figure 13-2 summarizes the D_{50} or 50% passing value from the cumulative grain size distribution of the fergusonite, bastnasite/synchysite, allanite, monazite, chevkinite, zircon, quartz/feldspars, muscovite, other silicates, oxides and overall particle size distribution (PSD) for the Fox HBR Aug-11 sample. The approximate D_{50} values are as follows:

- fergusonite 22 μm
- bastnasite/synchysite 51 μm
- allanite 65 μm
- monazite 24 μm
- chevkinite 53 μm
- zircon 24 μm
- quartz/feldspars 98 μm
- muscovite 24 μm
- other silicates 83 μm
- oxides 141 μm
- overall particle 98 μm

The grain size data indicates that it should be possible to liberate the REE minerals from the barren gangue minerals using a moderate grind size.

FIGURE 13-1 NORMALIZED MINERAL ABUNDANCE OF REE MINERALS





FIGURE 13-2 CUMULATIVE GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION



MINERAL CHEMISTRY

Electron microprobe analyses (EMPA) were conducted on chevkinite, allanite, fergusonite, bastnasite and synchysite, zircon and an undefined Si/Y/Ca REE phase.

- Allanite averages Ce 11.07 wt%, La 5.18 wt% and Nd 3.66 wt%, and minor Dy 0.40 wt%, Pr 0.92 wt%, Sm 0.24 wt%, Th 0.18% and Y 0.30 wt%.
- Fergusonite carries both, but mainly HREE (heavy rare earth elements) and less LREE (light rare earth elements). It averages Y 17.76%, Nb 29.20%, and minor Dy 3.63%, Gd 3.42%, Er 2.17%, Nd 1.76%, Ce 1.47%, Yb 1.27%, Sm 1.16%, La 0.44%, Ho 0.85%, Pr 0.25%, Tb 0.68%, Tm 0.38%, U 0.37 % and Th 0.61%.
- A Si-Y-Ca phase consists of Y 14.45%, Nd 8.07%, Ce 7.70%, Gd 3.99%, Dy 3.22%, Sm 2.94%, La 2.01%, Pr 1.42%, Yb 1.01% and Tb 0.58%, Tm 0.54% and Th 0.27%. This phase is tentatively identified as a Y-britholite.
- Bastnasite/Synchysite consists of, in average, Ce 27.42%, La 15.27%, Nd 10.92%, Pr 3.06%, Sm 1.44%, Gd 0.90%, Tm 0.33%, Dy 0.28%, Tb 0.24%, Yb 0.18%, Th 0.17%, and Y 0.68%.
- Chevkinite consists of Ce 16.74%, La 6.84%, Nd 6.69%, Pr 1.87%, Nb 1.28%, Gd 0.73%, Dy 0.68%, Sm 0.98%, Yb 0.15%, Th 0.56% and Y 1.72%.
- Although based on a limited number of analyses, there are two populations of zircon grains, with Y-bearing and Y-barren. Y ranges from nil to 0.66% and averages 0.15%.

LIBERATION AND ASSOCIATION

The liberation and association characteristics of allanite, fergusonite, bastnasite/ synchysite, monazite, chevkinite and zircon were examined.

- Free and liberated allanite account for 66.8%. The main association of allanite is as complex particles (25.8%), and minor middlings with zircon (3.8%) and quartz/feldspars (1.6%), and trace associations (<1%) with other minerals. Free and liberated allanite increases from 59.1% to 86.0% with decreasing size, while complex particles decrease from 33.4% in the +38 μm to 6.7% in the -38 μm fraction.
- Free and liberated fergusonite accounts for 31.4%. The main association of fergusonite is as complex particles (30.8%), followed by middlings with zircon (21.4%), quartz/feldspars (11.4%), and less with allanite (1.6%) and other silicates (1.5%), while other associations are insignificant (<1%). Liberation increases from 12.5% in the +38 μm fraction to 42.6% in the -38 μm fraction. Complex particles decrease from 48.5% to 20.3%, with quartz/feldspars from 26.2% to 2.6%, but those with zircon increase from 8.9% to 28.8%.

BENEFICIATION OF FOXTROT SAMPLE

Three beneficiation techniques were studied in order to concentrate the REE in the Foxtrot sample, including Wilfley tabling, magnetic separation, and flotation. The Wilfley tabling was used to test amenability to gravity concentration. Low Intensity Magnetic Separation (LIMS) was used to reject magnetite from the Wilfley concentrates. Flotation was tested both as a primary method of concentration for the Foxtrot sample and as a scavenging method to recover additional REE from the Wilfley tails. The work was preliminary in nature.

GRAVITY CONCENTRATION WITH THE WILFLEY TABLE AND MAGNETIC SEPARATION

A 100 kg charge was stage ground with the closing screen size of 105 μm . The -105 μm fraction was screened on 75 μm , and 38 μm screens to make three fractions. The +75 μm fraction was tabled and the tails re-passed. The test generated three fractions: Concentrate, Scavenger Middlings, Scavenger Tail. The +38 μm fraction was tabled and the tails repassed. The test generated three fractions: Conc, Scav Mids, Scav Tail. The -38 μm fraction was passed through the cyclone to eliminate unnecessary slimes on the table. The cyclone overflow was filtered. The cyclone underflow was passed over the Wilfley Table and the tail was re-passed. The Concentrate, Scavenger Middlings and Scavenger Tailings were submitted for assay. All the table concentrates were passed through LIMS to separate mainly magnetite. The flowsheet is shown in Figure 13-3.

Table 13-2 summarizes the results of the gravity and magnetic separation. It is possible to recover 71.4% of the Ce, 70.7% of the Nd and 70.7% of the Y into a concentrate containing 22.3% of the original mass. Flotation was also examined to enhance the overall recoveries.

FLOTATION SEPARATION

Flotation testing was conducted on a head sample. The flotation was performed as a rougher test with five stages of rougher flotation. Appropriate flotation reagents and test conditions were supplied by SGS for recovery of allanite and fergusonite. The feed particle size was 80% passing 150 µm. The flotation test results are shown in Table 13-3. Flotation by itself produced a concentrate containing 70.5% of the Ce, 73.6% of the Nd and 81.7% of the Y in a mass pull of 27.4%. These results are slightly better than the results of the gravity and magnetic separation.

As a last step in the beneficiation testing, the Wilfley table tails (three size fractions) were subjected to flotation to increase the overall recovery of REEs, excluding the cyclone overflow.

The analysis of this concentrate is shown in Table 13-4, along with the associated total recoveries. These results show that conventional beneficiation methods may be used to recover the REE minerals. Additional testwork using more selective beneficiation or incorporation of cleaning steps in the circuit may improve recoveries.




Figure 13-3

Search Minerals Inc.
Foxtrot Project
 Port Hope Simpson Area,
 Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada
**Gravity (Wilfley Table) and
 Magnetic Separation Flowsheet**

TABLE 13-2 SUMMARY OF THE BENEFICIATION OF 100 KG SAMPLE OF FOXTROT MATERIAL USING GRAVITY AND MAGNETIC SEPARATION
Search Minerals Inc. - Foxtrot Project

Prod. No.	Weight		Assays, %, g/t								% Distribution							
	g	%	CeO ₂	Nd ₂ O ₃	Y ₂ O ₃	ZrO ₂	Nb ₂ O ₅	SiO ₂	Al ₂ O ₃	Fe ₂ O ₃	CeO ₂	Nd ₂ O ₃	Y ₂ O ₃	ZrO ₂	Nb ₂ O ₅	SiO ₂	Al ₂ O ₃	Fe ₂ O ₃
1	8,713	9.53	1.50	0.58	0.39	2.15	0.24	57.8	3.70	17.3	33.8	32.2	28.5	12.0	23.5	8.12	4.88	14.6
2	1,484	1.62	0.09	0.12	0.10	0.76	0.10	4.43	0.30	97.4	0.35	1.10	1.25	0.72	1.65	0.11	0.07	14.0
3	167	0.18	0.25	0.12	0.10	0.76	0.10	69.9	7.67	11.4	0.11	0.12	0.14	0.08	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.18
4	28,797	31.5	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.57	0.01	76.8	8.50	4.10	3.66	2.13	2.39	10.5	4.58	35.6	37.1	11.5
5	5,082	5.56	1.56	0.57	0.39	3.09	0.31	58.0	4.20	15.4	20.5	18.4	16.6	10.1	17.8	4.75	3.23	7.61
6	917	1.00	0.07	0.03	0.08	0.55	0.03	4.23	0.35	95.7	0.17	0.20	0.58	0.33	0.29	0.06	0.05	8.52
7	329	0.36	0.10	0.03	0.08	0.55	0.03	77.4	8.06	3.78	0.08	0.07	0.21	0.12	0.10	0.41	0.40	0.12
8	17,382	19.0	0.11	0.05	0.05	0.62	0.04	75.3	8.53	5.68	4.97	5.14	7.34	6.93	8.29	21.1	22.5	9.60
9	6,576	7.20	1.00	0.48	0.40	8.37	0.33	61.5	5.44	9.52	17.0	20.0	21.9	35.3	24.1	6.52	5.42	6.08
10	976	1.07	0.12	0.05	0.10	1.10	0.05	5.64	0.48	92.7	0.30	0.31	0.81	0.69	0.54	0.09	0.07	8.79
11	34.3	0.04	0.31	0.13	0.11	3.54	0.09	70.8	8.02	6.14	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.08	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.02
12	12,914	14.1	0.31	0.12	0.09	2.20	0.06	70.8	8.04	7.43	10.3	9.55	9.55	18.2	8.21	14.7	15.7	9.33
13	8,019	8.77	0.42	0.21	0.16	0.97	0.12	63.9	8.54	12.3	8.71	10.7	10.7	4.99	10.7	8.26	10.4	9.59
Calc Head	91,388	100	0.42	0.17	0.13	1.71	0.10	67.9	7.22	11.3	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Dir Head			0.45	0.19	0.16	1.86	0.13	65.2	6.92	11.1								
Concentrate 1+5+9	20,370	22.3	1.35	0.55	0.40	4.39	0.29	59.0	4.39	14.31	71.4	70.7	67.0	57.4	65.4	19.4	13.5	28.3

TABLE 13-3 FLOTATION TEST RESULT FOR SCOPING ROUGHER TEST
Search Minerals Inc. - Foxtrot Project

Prod. No.	Weight		Assays, %, g/t								% Distribution							
	g	%	CeO ₂	Nd ₂ O ₃	Y ₂ O ₃	ZrO ₂	Nb ₂ O ₅	SiO ₂	Al ₂ O ₃	Fe ₂ O ₃	CeO ₂	Nd ₂ O ₃	Y ₂ O ₃	ZrO ₂	Nb ₂ O ₅	SiO ₂	Al ₂ O ₃	Fe ₂ O ₃
Rougher Conc.	536	27.4	1.14	0.52	0.35	4.71	0.27	46.1	4.66	27.4	70.5	73.6	81.7	73.3	62.7	19.0	18.0	65.8
Float Tails	1,419	72.6	0.18	0.07	0.03	0.65	0.06	74.2	8.04	5.39	29.5	26.4	18.3	26.7	37.3	81.0	82.0	34.2

**TABLE 13-4 COMBINED GRAVITY, MAGNETIC SEPARATION AND
FLOTATION CONCENTRATE PRODUCT**
Search Minerals Inc. - Foxtrot Project

	Units	Concentrate Assay	Recovery (%)
Weight	kg	35.17	-
Mass Pull	%	38.5	-
Ce ₂ O ₃	%	0.94	83.0
Nd ₂ O ₃	%	0.38	83.0
Y ₂ O ₃	%	0.31	83.7
ZrO ₂	%	3.71	65.9
Nb ₂ O ₅	%	0.22	81.8
La ₂ O ₃	g/t	3968	86.2
Pr ₆ O ₁₁	g/t	1160	86.6
Sm ₂ O ₃	g/t	741	84.3
Eu ₂ O ₃	g/t	34	83.7
Gd ₂ O ₃	g/t	559	82.7
Tb ₂ O ₃	g/t	93	82.4
Dy ₂ O ₃	g/t	543	81.4
Ho ₂ O ₃	g/t	105	81.6
Er ₂ O ₃	g/t	297	81.7
Tm ₂ O ₃	g/t	42	81.9
Yb ₂ O ₃	g/t	249	81.7
Lu ₂ O ₃	g/t	37	81.8
U ₃ O ₈	g/t	54	83.8
ThO ₂	g/t	274	86.6

HYDROMETALLURGICAL EXTRACTION OF REES FROM FOXTROT CONCENTRATE

The gravity concentrate (Table 13-2) and the combined gravity/flotation concentrate (Table 13-4) were subjected to acid leaching or acid baking at 200°C to 250°C followed by water leaching. The results of the testing are summarized in Table 13-5.


TABLE 13-5 HYDROMETALLURGICAL LEACHING STUDIES ON FOXTROT CONCENTRATES
 Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Test ID Feed	AL1 grav con	AL2 grav con	WL-AB1 AB1 calcine	WL-AB2 AB2 calcine	WL-AB3 AB3 calcine	WL-AB4 AB4 calcine	WL-AB5 AB5 calcine	WL-AB6 AB6 calcine	WL-AB7 AB7 calcine	WL-AB8 AB8 calcine	WL-AB9 AB9 calcine
H2SO4 Addn(kg/t)	1000	1000				1000			1000	750	500
Extraction (%)											
Si	2	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Al	16	29	15	16	15	17	14	16	16	15	14
Fe	19	35	19	20	35	37	33	32	34	34	33
Mg	15	28	18	19	45	42	44	41	41	38	49
Ca	32	54	36	32	42	45	40	38	36	39	33
Na	1	2	1	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	2
K	15	36	19	5	11	12	11	10	22	11	22
Ti	48	69	75	62	75	74	67	53	59	68	53
P	87	88	63	60	72	88	57	50	54	74	52
Mn	27	46	30	30	40	43	39	37	40	35	39
Zr	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
Nb	5	18	12	4	15	23	9	8	16	16	15
La	95	97	91	89	94	95	92	88	92	93	91
Ce	95	97	91	89	95	96	92	89	93	94	92
Pr	91	96	93	91	95	96	93	89	93	94	92
Nd	93	94	93	91	94	96	93	90	93	94	92
Sm	83	86	93	92	95	95	93	91	93	93	92
Eu	72	79	93	91	94	94	93	91	92	93	92
Gd	70	74	94	92	95	95	95	93	94	94	93
Tb	60	66	94	92	95	95	94	93	93	93	92
Dy	56	61	94	92	94	94	94	92	93	93	92
Ho	51	58	93	90	93	93	93	92	92	92	91
Er	48	54	90	88	91	91	91	89	89	89	89
Tm	46	54	85	84	86	87	86	85	85	85	84
Yb	46	51	78	77	79	80	79	77	77	77	77
Lu	38	45	64	65	65	68	68	66	65	65	64
Y	62	64	92	91	92	92	92	91	90	91	90
Sc	6	7	2	4	3	3	2	2	2	2	2
U	15	22	56	57	59	62	62	62	62	60	61
Th	85	80	96	95	97	97	96	94	96	97	94

AL = Atmospheric Leach, AB = Acid Bake, WL = Water Leach,

The results are summarized in Figure 13-4. The direct acid leach extractions were somewhat lower and produced slower solid/liquid separations. However, the acid bake and water leach results produced high extractions. If Zr and Nb elements are to be recovered from Foxtrot mineralization, it may be necessary to re-leach the acid leach residue (possibly with alkali). As well, the lighter REE are more highly extracted than the very heavy REE using the acid bake and water leach procedure. The acid leaching procedure (no acid bake) shows a much reduced extraction for the heavy REE.

FIGURE 13-4 EXTRACTION OF REE FOR THE ACID LEACH AND ACID BAKE – WATER LEACH TESTS



LEACH SOLUTION PURIFICATION AND RECOVERY OF MIXED REE PRODUCT

The leach solution purification involved simple pH adjustment to pH 3.0. At this pH, iron, aluminum, silica, titanium, phosphate, zirconium, niobium and thorium are removed as a mixed hydroxide waste precipitate.

After impurity precipitation, the solids were filtered and analyzed. The remaining solution was then treated with oxalic acid at pH 2.0 to precipitate the REE from solution. The form of the precipitate is as a mixed REE oxalate. The mixed REE oxalate was filtered and washed and analyzed. The results are summarized in Table 13

TABLE 13-6 MIXED OXALATE PRECIPITATE OF REE RECOVERED FROM SOLUTION

Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Element	Units	Oxalate Precipitate Analysis (% or ppm)	Oxide	Oxalate Precipitate Analysis (% or ppm)	Recovery from Solution (%)
La	%	7.8	La ₂ O ₃	9.15	99.96
Ce	%	18.3	Ce ₂ O ₃	21.43	100.0
Pr	%	2.1	Pr ₆ O ₁₁	2.54	99.97
Nd	%	8.7	Nd ₂ O ₃	10.15	99.98
Sm	%	1.24	Sm ₂ O ₃	1.44	99.94
Eu	ppm	759	Eu ₂ O ₃	879	99.12
Gd	ppm	11,600	Gd ₂ O ₃	13,370	99.95
Tb	ppm	1,840	Tb ₂ O ₃	2,164	99.66
Dy	ppm	10,600	Dy ₂ O ₃	12,165	99.90
Ho	ppm	2,020	Ho ₂ O ₃	23,14	99.80
Er	ppm	5,430	Er ₂ O ₃	6,209	99.85
Tm	ppm	735	Tm ₂ O ₃	839	98.92
Yb	ppm	4,240	Yb ₂ O ₃	4,828	99.90
Lu	ppm	499	Lu ₂ O ₃	567	98.81
Y	ppm	50,763	Y ₂ O ₃	64,466	99.99
U	ppm	5.5	U ₃ O ₈	6	23.17
Th	ppm	282	ThO ₂	321	97.73
		LREO	%	44.70	

Note: Y analysis not available. Y solid analysis entered as estimate using Nd analysis of precipitate as reference

SUMMARY

The metallurgical process has been studied from initial recovery of a REE concentrate through to the purification of a leach solution and precipitation of a mixed product. Table 13-7 summarizes an overall recovery to a final mixed REE product.

TABLE 13-7 OVERALL RECOVERY OF REE
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Oxide	Conc. Recovery (%)	Leach Extraction	Impurity Loss	Precip. Efficiency (Oxalate)	Overall Recovery
Ce ₂ O ₃	82.98	95.89	0.96	100.00	78.80
Nd ₂ O ₃	83.04	95.64	1.18	99.98	78.47
Y ₂ O ₃	83.71	92.48	1.12	99.99	76.54
La ₂ O ₃	86.21	95.29	0.77	99.96	81.49
Pr ₆ O ₁₁	86.56	95.79	1.06	99.97	82.01
Sm ₂ O ₃	84.32	94.70	1.17	99.94	78.88
Eu ₂ O ₃	83.73	94.28	1.19	99.12	77.31
Gd ₂ O ₃	82.65	95.30	1.01	99.95	77.93
Tb ₂ O ₃	82.38	94.69	1.07	99.66	76.91
Dy ₂ O ₃	81.36	94.21	1.07	99.90	75.76
Ho ₂ O ₃	81.59	93.31	1.08	99.8	75.15
Er ₂ O ₃	81.67	90.83	1.17	99.85	73.21
Tm ₂ O ₃	81.87	86.80	1.26	98.92	69.41
Yb ₂ O ₃	81.73	79.89	1.50	99.90	64.25
Lu ₂ O ₃	81.75	67.70	1.45	98.81	53.90

At this early stage of process flowsheet development, RPA is not aware of any processing factors or deleterious elements that could have a significant effect on economic extraction.

RECOMMENDATIONS

SGS Minerals Services have recommended that further optimization work be started to confirm and improve the results obtained to date as well as to start pilot plant design testwork. Following optimization work, SGS Minerals Services have further recommended continuous metallurgical pilot plant studies. The continuous pilot plant results would be used to support Pre-feasibility and Feasibility studies of the Foxtrot Project.

RPA concurs with the SGS recommendations.

14 MINERAL RESOURCE ESTIMATE

SUMMARY

Table 14-1 summarizes the Mineral Resource estimate for the Foxtrot Project as of September 30, 2012.

TABLE 14-1 SUMMARY MINERAL RESOURCE ESTIMATE – SEP. 30, 2012
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Classification	Zone	Tonnage (000 t)	Dy (ppm)	Nd (ppm)	Y (ppm)	HREE (%)	TREE (%)
Indicated	Central	9,229	189	1,442	1,040	0.17	0.88
Indicated	Extensions	--	--	--	--	--	--
Indicated Total		9,229	189	1,442	1,040	0.17	0.88
Inferred	Central	3,291	178	1,339	982	0.16	0.83
Inferred	Extensions	1,874	171	1,046	960	0.16	0.67
Inferred Total		5,165	176	1,233	974	0.16	0.77

Classification	Zone	Tonnage (000 t)	Dy ₂ O ₃ (ppm)	Nd ₂ O ₃ (ppm)	Y ₂ O ₃ (ppm)	HREO (%)	TREO (%)
Indicated	Central	9,229	218	1,687	1,345	0.21	1.07
Indicated	Extensions	--	--	--	--	--	--
Indicated Total		9,229	217	1,687	1,320	0.21	1.06
Inferred	Central	3,291	205	1,567	1,247	0.20	1.00
Inferred	Extensions	1,874	197	1,224	1,219	0.19	0.81
Inferred Total		5,165	202	1,442	1,237	0.20	0.93

Notes:

1. CIM definitions were followed for Mineral Resources.
2. Mineral Resources are estimated at a cut-off grade of 130 ppm Dy.
3. Numbers may not add due to rounding.
4. Heavy Rare Earth Elements (HREE) = Eu+Gd+Tb+Dy+Ho+Er+Tm+Yb+Lu+Y
5. Light Rare Earth Elements (LREE) = La+Ce+Pr+Nd+Sm
6. Total Rare Earth Elements (TREE) = sum of HREE and LREE
7. HREO, LREO refer to oxides of heavy and light rare earth elements respectively, and TREO is the sum of HREO and LREO.
8. Resources have been estimated inside a preliminary pit shell.

DATA

DRILL HOLES AND CHANNEL SAMPLES

Figure 14-1 shows the collar locations of the 72 diamond drill holes and 23 surface channel samples that were used for resource estimation. The drill holes include 18 holes (3,138 m) drilled in 2010, 48 holes (13,925 m) drilled in 2011, and six holes (1,771 m) drilled in 2012. All of the channel samples (459 m) were collected during 2011.

In Figure 14-1, the drill holes and channel samples used in the previous resource estimation are shown in gray; the newer drill holes and channel samples that post-date the previous resource estimation are shown in black. The new samples include 29 drill holes that intersect the mineralized bands at greater depths in the Central Area. These deeper intersections, which confirm the down-dip continuity of the resources previously reported, are the main reason for an increase in resource tonnage.

ASSAYS

All of the assay data available at the end of April 2012 were used for resource estimation. At this cut-off date, a total of 14,837 assays were available, with a total length of 17,827 m.

For sample intervals where internal lab duplicates existed, the assay used for resource estimation purposes was the first assay. All of the duplicates were checked and in no case was there a significant difference between the first assay and the internal duplicate.



DENSITY

During the site visit in 2011, 28 samples were collected for determination of dry bulk density. The five augen gneiss samples had an average dry bulk density of 2.53 t/m³. The 12 felsic samples had an average dry bulk density of 2.71 t/m³. The 11 mafic samples had an average dry bulk density of 2.88 t/m³. These averages were used to calculate tonnages from volumes for each of the three rock types.

TOPOGRAPHY

The topographic surface used for the current resource estimation was created by merging surveyed drill hole collars and the regional topographic contours from the public Geoscience Atlas provided by the government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

With drill hole collars differing from the government's regional topography by up to plus or minus six metres, the regional topography was locally modified by calculating residuals at the collar locations, creating a smoothed map of the residuals, and adding the map of residuals to the original regional topography. The result, shown in Figure 14-2, is a topography model that reflects the broad shape of the regional topography while exactly honouring the surveyed elevations at all of the hole collar locations.



December 2012

Source: Search Minerals Inc., 2012.

Figure 14-1

Search Minerals Inc.

Foxtrot Project

Port Hope Simpson Area,
Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada

Location of Drill Holes and Channel Samples
used for 2011 Resource Estimation





Figure 14-2



Search Minerals Inc.

Foxtrot Project

*Port Hope Simpson Area,
Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada*

**Topography used for
Resource Estimation**

DATA ANALYSIS

There are 17 elements included in the Foxtrot Project resource block model:

- La, Ce, Pr, Nd, Sm, Eu, Gd, Tb, Dy, Ho, Er, Tm, Yb and Lu (all of the lanthanoids with the exception of promethium (Pm), which does not occur in nature)
- Yttrium (Y), which is usually classified as a rare earth
- Zirconium (Zr) and Niobium (Nb), which are not classified as rare earths

Also included are combinations of the oxides of these 17 metals: the total rare earth oxides (TREO), the light rare earth oxides (LREO) and the heavy rare earth oxides (HREO).

Some of the following discussion of statistical analysis focuses on two elements, dysprosium (Dy) and neodymium (Nd). Dy has been chosen since it is the heavy rare-earth element (HREE) at Foxtrot with the greatest in situ value (grade X metal price). Similarly, Nd has been chosen since it is the light rare-earth element (LREE) with the greatest in situ value.

Table 14-2 shows the correlation coefficients between the 17 elements. Within the LREE group (La, Ce, Pr, Nd, and Sm), highlighted in blue, the correlations are extremely high (>0.98). With Nd having an excellent correlation (0.99) with each of the light rare earths, its statistical characteristics are a good surrogate for the entire LREE group. Within the HREE group (Eu, Gd, Tb, Dy, Ho, Er, Tm, Yb, Lu, and Y), highlighted in green, the correlations are all strong (>0.80). Dy has a very good correlation (> 0.90) with each of the heavy rare earth elements and is a good surrogate for any element in the HREE group. The observations presented in the following sections about Dy and Nd are also pertinent to the other elements with which they share a strong correlation.

TABLE 14-2 CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

	<i>La</i>	<i>Ce</i>	<i>Pr</i>	<i>Nd</i>	<i>Sm</i>	<i>Eu</i>	<i>Gd</i>	<i>Tb</i>	<i>Dy</i>	<i>Ho</i>	<i>Er</i>	<i>Tm</i>	<i>Yb</i>	<i>Lu</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Zr</i>	<i>Nb</i>
<i>La</i>	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.94	0.97	0.93	0.91	0.89	0.87	0.85	0.84	0.82	0.91	0.75	0.89
<i>Ce</i>		1.00	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.96	0.98	0.95	0.93	0.91	0.89	0.87	0.86	0.84	0.93	0.77	0.89
<i>Pr</i>			1.00	0.99	0.99	0.96	0.98	0.95	0.93	0.91	0.90	0.88	0.86	0.85	0.93	0.77	0.89
<i>Nd</i>				1.00	0.99	0.97	0.98	0.96	0.93	0.91	0.90	0.88	0.86	0.85	0.93	0.77	0.89
<i>Sm</i>					1.00	0.96	0.99	0.98	0.96	0.94	0.93	0.91	0.90	0.88	0.95	0.80	0.90
<i>Eu</i>						1.00	0.95	0.92	0.90	0.88	0.86	0.84	0.82	0.80	0.89	0.71	0.85
<i>Gd</i>							1.00	0.99	0.98	0.97	0.96	0.94	0.93	0.91	0.97	0.81	0.90
<i>Tb</i>								1.00	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.97	0.96	0.95	0.99	0.83	0.89
<i>Dy</i>									1.00	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.98	0.96	0.99	0.83	0.88
<i>Ho</i>										1.00	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.99	0.84	0.87
<i>Er</i>											1.00	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.99	0.84	0.87
<i>Tm</i>												1.00	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.85	0.86
<i>Yb</i>													1.00	0.99	0.98	0.86	0.85
<i>Lu</i>														1.00	0.97	0.86	0.84
<i>Yb</i>															1.00	0.83	0.88
<i>Zr</i>																1.00	0.77
<i>Nb</i>																	1.00

Note:

Blue = Light Rare Earth Elements

Green = Heavy Rare Earth Elements

HISTOGRAMS AND SUMMARY STATISTICS

Figure 14-3 shows histograms of Dy and Nd for all samples. The distributions show three prominent modes that correspond to the three main rock units. The lowest mode belongs to samples from the Mafic Volcanic (MV) unit and from the Augen Gneiss (AG), the rock units that bound two steeply-dipping zones of mixed volcanics known as the Foxtrot (FT) and Road Belt. The middle and upper modes belong to samples from the FT and Road Belt zones of mixed volcanics.

FIGURE 14-3 HISTOGRAMS AND SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR DYSPROSIUM AND NEODYMIUM FOR ALL SAMPLES





FIGURE 14-4 HISTOGRAMS AND SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR DYSPROSIUM AND NEODYMIUM IN FELSIC BANDS.



The FT and Road Belt zones consist of inter-layered bands of felsic and mafic volcanics. Within these zones, the felsic rocks predominate, accounting for approximately two-thirds of the zone. Virtually all of the mineralization with economic potential lies in the felsic bands; the vast majority of this lies in the felsic bands in the southern parts of the FT zone. Figure 14-4 shows the histograms of Dy and Nd in the felsic bands of the FT and Road Belt zones. The main mode (around 40 ppm Dy and 200 ppm Nd) corresponds to the northern parts of the FT

zone and to the Road Belt zone, where the mineralization in the felsics is generally weaker than in the southern parts of the FT. The high mode (around 200 ppm Dy and 1,500 ppm Nd) corresponds to the felsic bands that lie in the southern parts of the FT zone.

Table 14-3 provides, for all 17 elements, a statistical summary of the distributions of the samples from the felsic bands.

TABLE 14-3 SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR FELSIC SAMPLES
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

	N	Average (ppm)	Standard Deviation (ppm)	Coefficient of Variation	Minimum (ppm)	25th percentile (ppm)	Median (ppm)	75th percentile (ppm)	Maximum (ppm)
La	6,757	695.9	757.5	1.09	3.3	158	313	1,180	5,460
Ce	6,757	1,394.6	1,505.7	1.08	6.1	319	621	2,380	10,800
Pr	6,757	159.4	172	1.08	0.6	35.8	69.9	274	1,210
Nd	6,757	593.6	643.8	1.08	2.4	131	255	1,030	4,360
Sm	6,757	109.4	113.8	1.04	0.8	27.9	49.5	181	703
Eu	6,757	5.3	5.8	1.09	0.1	1.3	2	9.2	35.7
Gd	6,757	87.7	88.6	1.01	1.2	24.6	41.3	143	548
Tb	6,757	14.2	14	0.99	0.2	4.3	6.9	22.8	155
Dy	6,757	82.7	82	0.99	1.6	25.5	40.6	134	1,100
Ho	6,757	16	15.9	0.99	0.4	5	7.9	25.7	232
Er	6,757	45.6	45	0.99	1.2	14.2	22.9	73.4	661
Tm	6,757	6.6	6.5	0.98	0.2	2.1	3.4	10.6	94
Yb	6,756	41.7	40.3	0.97	1.1	13.4	22.4	66.1	537
Lu	6,757	6.3	6	0.95	0.2	2.1	3.6	10	72.6
Yb	6,757	455.3	458.2	1.01	11	135	217	750	6,447
Zr	6,757	4,500.4	4,813.7	1.07	21	1,302	2,141	7,251	72,680
Nb	6,559	289.6	2,94.2	1.02	4	78	137	525	1,360

GRADE CAPPING

No capping of high-grade assays was required since all of the grade distributions for felsic samples had very low coefficients of variation, close to one, which indicates that averages are not dominated by a few extremely high values. Local grade interpolation, which uses local weighted averages, was not affected by spatially erratic extreme values creating large halos of abnormally high grade estimates.

VARIOGRAMS

With very strong correlations between all of the elements, a single variogram model was used. Figure 14-5 shows the average experimental variogram for all elements, with the averaging being done after the sill of the variogram for each element has been standardized to one. The experimental variograms in this figure use only the assay data from felsic sample intervals, and group them into three directions:

- along the strike of the FT and Road Belt zones, horizontally in the N75°W direction;
- down the dip, 70° to 90° downward from horizontal in the N15°E direction; and,
- perpendicular to the banding, 0° to 20° upward from horizontal in the N15°E direction.

The direction of maximum continuity is the strike direction, with a range of 280 m. In the down-dip direction, the range is 140 m, and across the felsic bands the range is only 10 m.

FIGURE 14-5 AVERAGE VARIOGRAM FOR ALL ELEMENTS IN THE FELSIC ZONE

ALONG STRIKE:


Nugget effect = 0.15	Number of structures = 1	Total sill = 1.0
Structure 1: Height = 0.85	Range = 280	Type = Exponential

DOWN DIP:

Nugget effect = 0.15	Number of structures = 1	Total sill = 1.0
Structure 1: Height = 0.85	Range = 140	Type = Exponential

PERPENDICULAR TO BANDS:

Nugget effect = 0.15	Number of structures = 1	Total sill = 1.0
Structure 1: Height = 0.85	Range = 10	Type = Exponential



RESOURCE BLOCK MODEL CONFIGURATION

As shown in Figures 14-6 and 14-7, the block model uses 10 m by 5 m by 10 m blocks that are aligned with the strike of the deposit, which is in the N75°W direction. The block model has 211 columns in the strike direction, 141 rows in the horizontal direction across the strike of the deposit, and 54 levels in the vertical direction.




Figure 14-6


Search Minerals Inc.

Foxtrot Project

Port Hope Simpson Area,
 Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada

Map View of Block Model

14-13



Bottom of first level of block model is at -435m
Top of 31st level of block model is at +105m




Figure 14-7

Search Minerals Inc.

Foxtrot Project

*Port Hope Simpson Area,
Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada*

**Longitudinal Section View of
Block Model, Looking N15°E**

As shown in Figure 14-7, the base of the block model is at -435 m, which is about 50 m below the base of the Phase III drilling in the Central Area. With the range of correlation in the down-dip direction being 140 m, and with the deepest drill holes still showing strong mineralization, extending the block model 50 m beneath the base of drilling is reasonable. Resources beneath the base of drilling were classified as Inferred. No resources were estimated at depths greater than 50 m below the base of drilling.

RESOURCE ESTIMATION PROCEDURE

MINERALIZED DOMAINS

The contacts of the FT and Road Belt bands were modelled in 3D and wireframed to produce the surfaces shown in red in Figure 14-8. Tonnage and grade estimates were produced for all 10 m by 5 m by 10 m blocks with centres within the FT band or RB band, below the topography, and within 50 m of a drill hole in the vertical direction (the dotted line in Figure 14-7).

LOCAL DIP DIRECTIONS

Although the FT and Road Belt bands are approximately tabular, there are variations in the local dip; as seen on Figure 14-8, the dip is nearly vertical in some places and can flatten to about 65° in others.

To improve local precision of the tonnage and grade estimates, the local dip was estimated for each block, using the geological cross-sections to provide control points that were then interpolated to a regular grid using inverse-distance-squared interpolation. Figure 14-9 shows an example of the grid of local dips.

In all of the kriging calculations done for the tonnage and grade estimates, the dip direction of the variogram model and the search radius is locally adjusted so that it is aligned with the dip value estimated for that block. The use of a locally-varying dip direction allows undulations in the FT and Road Belt bands to be captured without breaking up the ore bands into sub-parallel en echelon pods that are disconnected.




Figure 14-8

Search Minerals Inc.
Foxtrot Project
 Port Hope Simpson Area,
 Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada
West-Facing Cross-Section
 Showing the Interpretation of the
 Contacts of the FT and Road Belt Bands




Figure 14-9

Search Minerals Inc.
Foxtrot Project
 Port Hope Simpson Area,
 Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada
**West-Facing Cross-Section Showing
 the Grid of Locals Dips Estimated
 from the Geological Information**

TONNAGE ESTIMATION

For each block being estimated, the first step was to estimate its tonnage, which depended on the proportion of felsic material in the block. The proportion of felsic material was estimated using an indicator kriging of the nearby samples, with the felsic intervals coded as one and the non-felsic (usually mafic) intervals coded as zero. The variogram model used for this indicator kriging was the one shown in Figure 14-5. The radiuses of the search ellipse were set to half of the variogram ranges (140 m by 70 m by 5 m), and aligned with the strike and local dip. An octant search was used to limit the number of samples from any one quadrant, with no more than three samples being used per octant. This indicator kriging produces an estimate of the proportion of felsic material in the block; the remaining material is assumed to be mafic.

Once the volume proportion of felsic and mafic material had been estimated, the tonnage of the block was calculated by multiplying the volume-weighted average of the 2.71 t/m³ density for felsic material and the 2.88 t/m³ density for mafic material. The separate tonnages of the felsic and the mafic material in the block were also written to the block model file so that the resource inventory could tabulate felsic tonnages and grades separately from the mafic material.

GRADE ESTIMATION

The grades of the 17 elements were estimated by ordinary kriging of the assays; no compositing was done. Half of the sample intervals are exactly one metre in length, but there are some as short as 0.05 m, and some as long as 2.5 m. To account for the fact that some of the assays used for local grade interpolation have different lengths than others, the ordinary kriging weights were multiplied by the sample length and then renormalized to sum to one.

For each block being estimated, the direction of maximum continuity was aligned with the strike of the FT and Road Belt bands (N75°W). The direction of intermediate continuity was aligned with the dip, as given by the grid of interpolated dip values. The direction of minimum continuity was perpendicular to the other two. The search ellipse had radiuses equal to half the range of the variogram model: 140 m in the strike direction, 70 m in the dip direction, and five metres in the direction perpendicular to the felsic banding.

A maximum of three samples per octant were used for estimation. When more than three samples were available in any octant, the three retained for estimation were those with the lowest variogram value, i.e. the closest in terms of statistical distance, not Euclidean distance.

The grade of the felsic portion of each block was estimated using the nearby felsic assays, and the grade of the mafic portion was estimated using the nearby mafic assays. The block model records the average grade of the entire block (i.e. the tonnage-weighted average of the felsic and mafic portions) and also records the separate grades of the felsic and mafic portions of each block. Resources have been inventoried by comparing the grade of the felsic proportion to the cut-off grade; this approach implies that a future mining operation will have the ability to separate felsic material from mafic. Although no specific testing of this has yet been done, the strong visual difference between felsic and mafic material suggests that some ore sorting technology, such as optical sorting, would be successful at separating felsic material from mafic material.

RESOURCE CLASSIFICATION

Mineral resources have been classified in accordance with the CIM (2010):

A **Measured Mineral Resource** is that part of a Mineral Resource for which quantity, grade or quality, densities, shape, physical characteristics are so well established that they can be estimated with confidence sufficient to allow the appropriate application of technical and economic parameters, to support production planning and evaluation of the economic viability of the deposit. The estimate is based on detailed and reliable exploration, sampling and testing information gathered through appropriate techniques from locations such as outcrops, trenches, pits, workings and drill holes that are spaced closely enough to confirm both geological and grade continuity.

An **Indicated Mineral Resource** is that part of a Mineral Resource for which quantity, grade or quality, densities, shape and physical characteristics can be estimated with a level of confidence sufficient to allow the appropriate application of technical and economic parameters, to support mine planning and evaluation of the economic viability of the deposit. The estimate is based on detailed and reliable exploration and testing information gathered through appropriate techniques from locations such as outcrops, trenches, pits, workings and

drill holes that are spaced closely enough for geological and grade continuity to be reasonably assumed.

An **Inferred Mineral Resource** is that part of a Mineral Resource for which quantity and grade or quality can be estimated on the basis of geological evidence and limited sampling and reasonably assumed, but not verified, geological and grade continuity. The estimate is based on limited information and sampling gathered through appropriate techniques from locations such as outcrops, trenches, pits, workings and drill holes.

Resource classification was based on two criteria: the number of octants with data, and the horizontal and vertical position of the block:

- Blocks were classified as Indicated if they were estimated using data in all octants, if they were in the Central Area (Figure 14-1), and if they were above the base of drilling (Figure 14-7). These requirements limit the Indicated Resources to the well-drilled heart of the deposit.
- All blocks not classified as Indicated were classified as Inferred if they were above the base of drilling, or no more than 50 m below the base of drilling (Figure 14-7). With the search ellipse having used radii that were half of the variogram range, this requirement limits the Inferred Resources to regions where there is at least one well correlated sample nearby. In the vertical direction, the requirement is a bit more restrictive: Inferred Resources cannot extend more than 50 m down-dip from the Phase II drill holes.

CHECKS OF RESOURCE BLOCK MODEL

The resource block model was checked visually against the original drill hole data on cross-sections, maps, and in a 3D viewer to confirm that the estimated felsic content and the estimated grades were consistent with nearby drill hole data, that the topography and the geologic contacts were respected and that the classification properly showed only Inferred material below the base of drilling and in the extensions east and west of the Central Area. Figure 14-10 shows an example of one of these checks, a section showing the grade estimates on the cross-section with the deepest drilling. In addition to honouring the drill hole data, the classification is also correct, as shown by the dark (Indicated) and light (Inferred) blue shading of the estimated blocks.




Figure 14-10

Search Minerals Inc.

Foxtrot Project

*Port Hope Simpson Area,
Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada*
**Example of Check of
Block Estimates and Classification
on Cross-Section 2350**

MINERAL RESOURCE ESTIMATE

The classified Mineral Resource estimate is presented in Table 14-4 below, using a reporting cut-off of 130 ppm on dysprosium. Using preliminary assessments of metal prices and metallurgical recoveries, this reporting cut-off, which corresponds to 150 ppm on Dy_2O_3 , produces an NSR considerably higher than the cost of mining and processing ore. Even with changes and uncertainties in the metal prices, recoveries and costs, material with more than 130 ppm Dy meets the requirement of the CIM Definition Standards: that Mineral Resources have a reasonable prospect of economic extraction.

The resource estimate has also been constrained by an ultimate pit shell to ensure that it properly reflects a geometry that is amenable to open pit mining methods.

SENSITIVITY OF REPORTING CUT-OFF

Some of the uncertainties in metal prices, metallurgical recoveries and the cost of mining and processing were investigated in the July 15, 2012 PEA study. But even when a more detailed analysis of technical and economic parameters is available, there will very likely still be uncertainty in the reporting cut-off that best reflects a break-even economic cut-off in the future. Fortunately, the strong correlations between the various elements that contribute economic value make it possible to assess the sensitivity of resources to changes in the cut-off grade. Changes in the reporting cut-off grade of dysprosium will correspond very directly to changes in the cut-off grade of any other element, groups of elements, or NSR. Table 14-5 shows how resource tonnage and grade are affected by ± 25 ppm changes in the dysprosium cut-off; this magnitude of change is approximately a $\pm 20\%$ change in the reporting cut-off.

TABLE 14-4 MINERAL RESOURCES– SEPTEMBER 30, 2012
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

		Central	Indicated Extensions	Total	Central	Inferred Extensions	Total
Tonnage (t)		9,229,000	--	9,229,000	3,291,000	1,874,000	5,165,000
Element	Units						
Y	ppm	1,040	--	1,040	982	960	974
La	ppm	1,646	--	1,646	1,564	1,183	1,426
Ce	ppm	3,337	--	3,337	3,139	2,429	2,881
Pr	ppm	384	--	384	359	280	330
Nd	ppm	1,442	--	1,442	1,339	1,046	1,233
Sm	ppm	262	--	262	245	197	228
Eu	ppm	13	--	13	12	9	11
Gd	ppm	205	--	205	193	165	183
Tb	ppm	33	--	33	30	28	30
Dy	ppm	189	--	189	178	171	176
Ho	ppm	37	--	37	35	34	34
Er	ppm	103	--	103	98	98	98
Tm	ppm	15	--	15	14	15	14
Yb	ppm	92	--	92	88	95	91
Lu	ppm	14	--	14	13	15	14
Zr	ppm	9,619	--	9,619	9,538	10,987	10,064
Nb	ppm	626	--	626	585	455	538
LREE	%	0.71	--	0.71	0.66	0.51	0.61
HREE	%	0.17	--	0.17	0.16	0.16	0.16
TREE	%	0.88	--	0.88	0.83	0.67	0.77
Oxide	Units						
Y ₂ O ₃	ppm	1,320	--	1,320	1,247	1,219	1,237
La ₂ O ₃	ppm	1,926	--	1,926	1,830	1,385	1,669
CeO ₂	ppm	4,105	--	4,105	3,861	2,988	3,544
Pr ₆ O ₁₁	ppm	465	--	465	434	339	400
Nd ₂ O ₃	ppm	1,687	--	1,687	1,567	1,224	1,442
Sm ₂ O ₃	ppm	303	--	303	285	228	264
Eu ₂ O ₃	ppm	15	--	15	14	10	13
Gd ₂ O ₃	ppm	236	--	236	222	190	210
Tb ₄ O ₇	ppm	38	--	38	36	33	35
Dy ₂ O ₃	ppm	217	--	217	205	197	202
Ho ₂ O ₃	ppm	42	--	42	40	39	39
Er ₂ O ₃	ppm	118	--	118	112	112	112
Tm ₂ O ₃	ppm	17	--	17	16	17	16
Yb ₂ O ₃	ppm	105	--	105	100	109	103
Lu ₂ O ₃	ppm	16	--	16	15	17	16
ZrO ₂	ppm	12,985	--	12,985	12,877	14,832	13,586
Nb ₂ O ₅	ppm	789	--	789	737	573	677
LREO	%	0.85	--	0.85	0.8	0.62	0.73
HREO	%	0.21	--	0.21	0.2	0.19	0.2
TREO	%	1.06	--	1.07	1.05	0.81	0.93

Notes:

1. CIM definitions were followed for Mineral Resources.
2. Mineral Resources are estimated at a cut-off grade of 130 ppm Dy.
3. Numbers may not add due to rounding.
4. Heavy Rare Earth Elements (HREE) = Eu+Gd+Tb+Dy+Ho+Er+Tm+Yb+Lu+Y
5. Light Rare Earth Elements (LREE) = La+Ce+Pr+Nd+Sm
6. Total Rare Earth Elements (TREE) = sum of HREE and LREE
7. HREO, LREO refer to oxides of heavy and light rare earth elements respectively, and TREO is the sum of HREO and LREO.

8. Resources have been estimated inside a preliminary pit shell.

TABLE 14-5 SENSITIVITY OF TOTAL MINERAL RESOURCES TO CHANGES IN THE DY CUT-OFF GRADE

Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Classification	Dy Cut-off Grade (ppm)	Tonnage (t)	Dy (ppm)	Nd (ppm)	Y (ppm)	HREE+Y (%)	TREE+Y (%)
Indicated	130	9,229,000	189	1,442	1,040	0.17	0.88
	150	7,653,000	199	1,515	1,094	0.18	0.93
	170	6,056,000	210	1,594	1,149	0.19	0.97
	190	4,605,000	219	1,660	1,198	0.20	1.01
Inferred	130	5,165,000	176	1,233	974	0.16	0.77
	150	3,661,000	191	1,371	1,058	0.18	0.86
	170	2,537,000	204	1,523	1,137	0.19	0.95
	190	1,654,000	218	1,673	1,217	0.20	1.04
Classification	Dy ₂ O ₃ Cut-off Grade (ppm)	Tonnage (tonnes)	Dy ₂ O ₃ (ppm)	Nd ₂ O ₃ (ppm)	Y ₂ O ₃ (ppm)	HREO+Y (%)	TREO+Y (%)
Indicated	150	9,229,000	217	1,687	1,320	0.21	1.06
	173	7,653,000	229	1,772	1,389	0.22	1.11
	196	6,056,000	241	1,865	1,459	0.24	1.17
	219	4,605,000	252	1,943	1,521	0.25	1.22
Inferred	150	5,165,000	202	1,442	1,237	0.20	0.93
	173	3,661,000	219	1,604	1,343	0.22	1.03
	196	2,537,000	235	1,782	1,444	0.23	1.14
	219	1,654,000	251	1,957	1,545	0.25	1.25

15 MINERAL RESERVE ESTIMATE

A technical and economic assessment to permit a Mineral Reserve estimate on the Project has not yet been completed.

16 MINING METHODS

This section is taken from the July 15, 2012 PEA (Cox et al., 2012), and has not been updated to reflect the current Mineral Resource estimate contained in this report.

INTRODUCTION

RPA investigated the potential for open pit mining of the Indicated and Inferred Mineral Resources, using REE prices appropriate for a PEA. Open pit and underground mining options were evaluated with run of mine (ROM) material being processed at a rate of 3,000 tpd to 4,000 tpd in a process plant on site, producing a mixed rare earth product. Infrastructure requirements, for road access, power, and for room and board facilities, were also considered. Environmental considerations include the impact of the pit, waste rock dump, and tailings storage.

Open pit (OP) and underground (UG) mine operating costs (opex) were estimated based on preliminary mine concepts and on typical costs for Canadian mining operations of a similar scale. During the trade-off process, at the assumed process rate of 3,000 tpd and 8:1 open pit strip ratio, the open pit operating cost was estimated to be \$4.21/t, while the underground operating cost was estimated to be \$51.57/t. The underground operating cost includes direct opex, additional general and administration (G&A) (mainly due to greater manpower, additional accommodations, and higher fly-in fly-out expenses), and lateral/vertical development. This underground opex was itemized as follow:

- UG mining \$42.57/t milled
- UG capital development \$2.22/t milled
- UG additional G&A vs. OP \$6.78/t milled

The UG/OP opex ratio gives an open pit strip ratio of 11.25:1 as the break-even opex at which point the underground mining method should be more favourable. At this stage of the Project, considering the REE mineralization, the assumed open pit physicals and the overall operating cost, the optimal pits returned a maximum strip ratio of 6:1. As a result, a study on underground mining was not pursued any further for the Foxtrot Project.

OPEN PIT MINING

The production rate is assumed to be 1,440,000 tpa or 4,000 tpd of REE bearing material. Mining of mineralized material and waste (no pre-stripping of overburden is required, as the deposit is exposed on surface) would be carried out by the owner and by contractor to balance mining equipment requirements over the life of the operation.

The combination of owner-operated and contract mining will be carried out using a conventional open pit method consisting of the following activities:

- Drilling performed by conventional production drills.
- Blasting using ANFO (ammonium-nitrate fuel oil) and a down-hole delay initiation system.
- Loading and hauling operations performed with hydraulic shovel, front-end loader, and rigid frame haulage trucks.

The production equipment will be supported by bulldozers, graders, and water trucks.

GEOTECHNICAL ASSESSMENTS

In the absence of geotechnical information, pit slope angles were selected based on industry averages. Pit optimizations were carried out using pit slopes of 45°.

Design parameters for the waste dumps and the overburden pile were also selected based on industry averages.

These assumptions will have to be further assessed as the Project is advanced.

HYDROLOGICAL / HYDROGEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENTS

Hydrogeological and hydrological conditions may have an impact on pit design parameters. At this stage of the Project, industry average pit slope angles were used. Capital expenditures and operating costs related to water management were part of the cost estimation process.

The hydrogeological/hydrological conditions will have to be further assessed as the Project is advanced.

SEISMICITY

Seismicity issues were not considered in conceptual design at this point in the Project. The seismicity will have to be assessed and be considered in more detailed engineering steps of the Project.

MINE DESIGN

Open pit possibilities were investigated by pit optimization / floating cone analysis, using Whittle software, run on the resource block model. Pit optimizations indicated that a significant proportion of the resource block model would be economic to mine using open pit methods.

Whittle pit optimizations were performed based on typical costs for comparable operations and projects of a similar scale. Cost details for optimization purposes were as follows:

- Open pit mining \$4.21/t moved
- Milling \$60.00/t milled
- G&A \$7.75/t milled

NSR revenue factors were calculated using metallurgical recoveries, offsite costs for REE separation, and REE prices, which are discussed in detail under their respective sections in this report. The revenue factors were used to generate an NSR value in the model which was used to float cones in the Whittle software.

In the absence of geotechnical information, pit slope angles were selected based on industry averages. Pit optimizations were carried out using pit slopes of 45°.

Pit optimizations do not include individual benches or ramp design. For the pit size, production requirements, and recommended equipment fleet, RPA considers mining of 10 m benches and development of 22 m wide ramps, including ditches and safety berm, to be appropriate for the open pit operations. The ramps should be designed at 10% grade with exits appropriately located in order to minimize distances to the mill and the waste rock dumps. Figure 16-1 shows an isometric view showing the location of pit shells.

A general site plan of the Project, developed for the Base Case Open Pit Scenario, is included in Figure 16-2. This figure shows the location of main surface facilities as open pit, tailings pond and dams, waste dumps, process plant, camp facilities and haul roads.

PRODUCTION QUANTITIES

Production quantities total 14.3 Mt of potentially mineable material, at a grade of 0.58% total REE. This includes dilution of the mineralized felsic material with the intercalated mafic material in each block (assumed to have zero grade). The mafic material portion within mineralized blocks in the final pit shell supporting the above tonnage totals 3.1 Mt, which is equivalent to an internal dilution of 27.7% tonnage. On a block by block basis (10 m x 5 m x 10 m high) and within a PEA level of detail and precision, it was assumed that blocks mined at the contact of REE mineralization and waste will not contribute any additional dilution other than their intrinsic mafic material. Therefore, no operational dilution was added over and above and a 100% mining recovery factor was applied for the same reason.

As a result, the diluted and recovered tonnage and grades remained the same. Waste within the pit shell totals 105.8 Mt, resulting in an average strip ratio of 7.4:1. The difference with the maximum strip ratio of 6:1 reached in the pit optimization process is due to a post-cut-off grade increase within the final pit shell in order to improve the head grade at the process plant and to optimize the economics of the project.

The proportion of Inferred Resources in the material that may be potentially mineable via open pit is approximately 65%.

WASTE DUMP

A waste dump was designed to receive all waste materials contained in the open pit. As per Figure 16-2, the waste dump is located west of the open pit, with a height and total footprint of approximately 75 m and one kilometre square, respectively, considering a swell factor of 1.5.




Figure 16-1


Search Minerals Inc.

Foxtrot Project

*Port Hope Simpson Area,
Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada*

**Isometric View of Foxtrot Pit Shell
Looking NW**

December 2012



PRODUCTION SCHEDULE

Both the open pit owner-operated and contract mining will be carried out on two 12-hour shifts per day, seven days per week, with the exception of the first and last year of the LOM plan, when only one 12-hour shift / seven days per week will be required as the annual strip ratio will be lower. Staffing will be on a rotating shift system being carried out by four shift crews.

Highlights of the production schedule are as follow:

- A short ramp-up to full production in Year 1
- Production of 1,440,000 tonnes per year, or 4,000 tpd
- Waste mining average of 10.6 Mt per year
- Contractor assistance with high waste mining requirements in years 3 to 6

The production schedule is summarized in Table 16-1.

TABLE 16-1 PRODUCTION SCHEDULE
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Year	Mined REE Bearing Material (Mt)	Mined Waste (Mt)
-2	-	-
-1	-	-
1	1,368,000	2,681,000
2	1,440,000	8,515,000
3	1,440,000	14,269,000
4	1,440,000	18,443,000
5	1,440,000	18,091,000
6	1,440,000	16,584,000
7	1,440,000	9,071,000
8	1,440,000	7,212,000
9	1,440,000	6,227,000
10	1,391,000	4,745,000
Total	14,279,000	105,838,000

MINE EQUIPMENT

The owner's mine equipment fleet for the open pit operation, listed in Table 16-2, was selected based on comparison to operations of similar size and using InfoMine USA Inc.

TABLE 16-2 OPEN PIT MINING FLEET
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Type	Quantity
Backhoe Hydraulic Shovel 13 m ³	1
Backhoe Hydraulic Shovel 2 m ³	1
Front End Loader 13 m ³	1
Haul Trucks 90 mt	10
Rotary Drill 17-27 cm	3
Dozer 305 kW	3
Grader 140 kW	1
Anfo Truck	1
Explosive Truck (cap)	1
Water Truck	1
Service Truck (for maintenance)	2
Lube/Fuel Truck	3
Loader (Yard Handling)	1
Pickup Truck	10
Bus (for people transportation)	1
Light Plants 10 kW	4
Concrete Truck	1
Zoom Boom	1

As discussed previously, a mining contractor would be hired in order to assist with high waste mining requirements from years 3 to 6 inclusively. The contractor mine fleet capacity was planned to be the same as the owner fleet capacity as the total material moved during these four years is approximately doubled. Therefore, the contractor mining fleet is as in the table above for the loading, hauling and drilling equipment, and for some support equipment.

MINE INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES

This section is dedicated to infrastructure directly associated with mine operations. For all other general infrastructure located at surface, see Section 18 (Project Infrastructure).

MATERIAL HANDLING

The mineralized material and waste will be hauled out of the pit with the off-highway equipment fleet listed previously. The waste will be transported to the waste dump, located west of the open pit. The REE bearing material (mill feed) will be delivered directly into the primary crusher or stockpiled nearby. Crushing will be performed prior to feeding the process plant.

DEWATERING

The dewatering system will comprise dewatering wells surrounding the open pit footprint. A pumping network will also be installed to pump water run-off from the open pit (three 75-kW pumps).

Pumped water from all sources will be directed through the water treatment system comprised of settling/polishing ponds prior to its release into the environment.

EXPLOSIVES AND DETONATORS

Detonators and explosives will be stored in approved explosives magazines. They will be located at a safe distance from the mining operations.

The explosives and detonators magazines will be located southwest of the open pit, along the haul road to the waste dump, and far enough from buildings and working areas. The selected site is shown on Figure 16-2.

Suppliers will deliver explosives and detonators directly into dedicated magazines for storage until use.

17 RECOVERY METHODS

This section is taken from the July 15, 2012 PEA (Cox et al., 2012), and has not been updated to reflect the current Mineral Resource estimate contained in this report.

PRELIMINARY PROPOSED PROCESS

The process will utilize the following basic unit operations: crushing, grinding, gravity recovery, magnetic separation, flotation, water leaching, acid bake, and solution purification to recover a mixed REE product, as shown below in Figure 17-1.

Ore will be crushed, ground and screened to produce a suitable sized product for gravity recovery. Gravity recovery unit operations may include tabling to produce separate sized material. The product from the tabling operation will be subjected to magnetic separation to remove magnetite. The tailings from the gravity recovery step will be subjected to flotation to increase REE recovery.

The non-magnetics from magnetic separation, and the flotation concentrate will be combined and sent to acid baking, and then to a water leaching step. The product from water leaching will go to solid liquid separation, with the REE containing solution sent to solution purification, and the solids sent to residue disposal. After solution purification, oxalic acid will be added to the remaining solution to form REO containing precipitate. This precipitate will be sent to solid/liquid separation to provide a solid mixed REO product, and a liquid residue.




Figure 17-1

Search Minerals Inc.

Foxtrot Project

*Port Hope Simpson Area,
Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada*

Process Flow Sheet

18 PROJECT INFRASTRUCTURE

This section is taken from the July 15, 2012 PEA (Cox et al., 2012), and has not been updated to reflect the current Mineral Resource estimate contained in this report.

The surface infrastructure area totals 400 ha and covers two watersheds. It has been assumed that except for the waste stockpile drainage the project infrastructure, including mine water discharge for the mine, will be located at the northern watershed.

POWER SUPPLY

Hydroelectric power is not available near the mine site. Power at Goose Bay is fed by a main power line coming from Churchill Falls but the straight distance between Goose Bay and the mine site is more than 300 km. Diesel driven generators will be installed at the mine site near the process plant. Maximum power demand will be on the order of 8 MW. The electric line network will be approximately eight kilometres in length and will supply the process plant, accommodation camp, pumping stations, mechanical shop, warehouse, service buildings, and site lighting.

A preventive maintenance program for diesel driven generators must be set up and carefully followed by mine site maintenance personnel and an emergency backup system will always have to be operational.

FUEL STORAGE

A central fuel storage system comprising two 900 m³ diesel storage tanks contained within a bunded area will be installed adjacent to the process plant and close to the mine services area. This fuel storage will mainly supply diesel driven generators and refuelling requirements for the mine fleet and light vehicles.

WATER SUPPLY

It is anticipated that raw water for process plant use will be sourced mainly from the tailings storage facility (TSF) polishing pond and a natural pond located south side of TSF. The main objective will be to maximize the amount of reused water for processing and use fresh water only when necessary.

It has been assumed that the accommodation camp will be supplied with fresh water, treated for potable use, from a bore hole located in close proximity to the site.

Water for fire hydrants will be supplied from a natural pond located at the south side of the TSF. The water will be pumped to a tank dedicated for fire emergencies. Six fire hydrants will be connected by a 200 mm diameter HDPE pipe and will be used to provide fire protection around the mine site.

ROADS

The site is located 500 m to the south of a public road which provides access to the small community of St-Lewis. It is anticipated that the 12-km road going to St-Lewis will require upgrades.

Approximately 10 km of road on site is required for the mining operation and to access site buildings. The travelling road has a planned 10 m width and radius of curvature of 200 m minimum and the production road from open pit to ROM pad and waste pad has a planned 20 m width and radius curvature of 250 m minimum. Waste coming from the open pit will be used as material to build the road base and after grinding-screening could be used as a rolling surface.

PARKING LOT

Two parking lots are planned for the Project. The capacity of the first one, located at the security gate, is planned to provide 40 spaces for visitors and personal cars of the workforce. The second parking lot, near mechanical shop, has a planned capacity of 50 spaces and will be used for production mobile equipments. The parking lots will be constituted by one metre of waste and 200 mm of granular material.

BUILDINGS

The following buildings are the major buildings located at the mine site. All buildings will be in steel frame metal clad construction-type with a concrete slab base. It is assumed that the foundations will be built on the bed rock with a minimum amount of filling material needed.

- Administration and Services Office
- Mill and concentrate loading/shipping installation
- Primary Crushing Plant
- Mechanical and Electrical Shop

- Warehouse
- Accommodation camp
- Main security gate house
- Community relations

ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICES OFFICE

The administration and services office building will accommodate mine management, administration, engineering/geology department, first aid room, training and meeting rooms, and a mine dry room. The building will be two storeys and completed in modules. Costs include the complete supply and installation of building foundations, mechanical equipment, and electrical equipment.

GARAGE, MAINTENANCE SHOPS AND WAREHOUSE

The garage will include a wash bay, five mechanical bays, and a welding shop. Four other shops adjacent to the garage and the main warehouse will be added for welders, carpenters, pump and accessories maintenance, and for electrical and instrumentation workers. There will be two levels in the warehouse with maintenance on the lower floor and parts storage and a dining room on the upper floor. In the electrical equipment maintenance local, a second floor will be occupied by maintenance foreman offices.

ACCOMMODATION CAMP - OPERATIONS

An accommodation camp will be constructed west of the plant site to house the permanent mining and process plant workforce. It is expected that this camp will have a total capacity of approximately 210 people. There will be sleeping rooms, a kitchen/dining facility, clinic, laundry, and recreation facilities.

ACCOMMODATION CAMP - CONSTRUCTION

Temporary accommodation for the construction phase will be located adjacent to the permanent camp site. The temporary camp will be removed upon completion of construction.

OTHER SITE INFRASTRUCTURE

Communications services for the Project will include voice (via existing commercial in-country cell phone systems), data/internet communications via satellite, and satellite cable services for television entertainment.

WASTE ROCK DUMP

The waste pile will be located one km west of the open pit and will have a maximum capacity of approximately 63 million m³ and a maximum height of 75 m.

TAILINGS DYKE

The tailings will be stored in a conventional tailings storage facility (TSF). The TSF concept is based on the assumption that the bedrock is impermeable and that the tailings are non-acid producing. Tailings will be transported through a 5-km HDPE pipe (250 mm ID).


The TSF will ultimately cover a maximum area of 90 ha. Location of the TSF is shown in Figure 18-1. The dyke, anticipated to be constructed using ROM waste, will have the capacity to enclose 6 million m³ of tailings and will require 1.5 million m³ of rock fill for construction.

PORT

The infrastructure facilities at the port at St-Lewis will require upgrades, including the construction of a cold shed and concentrate storage facility. Sea containers, concentrate, and consumables delivered to port are assumed to be handled by the mine personnel.

AIRPORT

Aircraft will be based on Dash 8 Series 300, Q400 or other type of aircraft having a capacity of at least 55 passengers needing a minimum airstrip length of 1.3 to 1.6 km; the current landing runway is 700 m in length. Therefore the current airstrip of St-Lewis must be upgraded or relocated.



December 2012

19 MARKET STUDIES AND CONTRACTS

This section is taken from the July 15, 2012 PEA (Cox et al., 2012), and has not been updated to reflect the current Mineral Resource estimate contained in this report.

RARE EARTHS

RPA collected historical price information, supply/demand analysis, and long term forecasts for REO. The sources of price information include the websites of Metal-PagesTM and Asian Metal, and analyst reports by Asian Metal, TD (Toronto Dominion) Newcrest Inc., and CIBC (Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce).

RARE EARTH SUPPLY

Rare earths are found in more than 200 minerals, of which about a third contain significant concentrations. Only a handful, however, have potential commercial interest. The most important source minerals are carbonates (bastnaesite) and phosphates (monazite and xenotime). Apatite is also an important source of rare earths, while heavy rare earths are more commonly found in minerals in granitic and alkaline rocks and in ionic clays. The main geological environments for rare earths are:

- Carbonatites – bastnaesite (Mountain Pass, California; Kola Peninsula; Russia, Sichuan, China)
- Monazite and xenotime-bearing placers (west coast of Australia; east coast of India)
- Iron-bastnaesite rare earth element deposits (Bayan Obo, Inner Mongolia; Olympic Dam, Australia)
- Ion absorption clays (Longnan, Jiangxi, China)
- loparite and eudialyte in alkaline intrusives (Kola Peninsula, Russia; Dubbo, Australia)
- Pegmatites, hydrothermal quartz and fluorite veins (Northern Territories, Australia; Karonge, Burundi; Naboomspruit, South Africa)

Other generic types which may contain rare earths are:

- Phosphates (Phosphoria Formation, western USA),
- Uranium deposits in sandstone and black shales (Wheeler River, Alberta; Williston Basin, Saskatchewan),

- Mylonites in limestones (Nam-Nam-Xe, Vietnam),
- Scheelite skarns (Ingichke, Uzbekistan),
- Nickel deposits (Sudbury Basin, Ontario).

By far the most important current sources of rare earths are the Bayan Obo iron rare earth deposits near Baotou, Inner Mongolia, the bastnaesite deposits in Sichuan, China and the ionic clay deposits in southern China. China is the dominant source of all rare earth oxides, accounting for approximately 97% of world production in 2009. Light rare earths are primarily produced in northern China (Inner Mongolia) and south-western China (Sichuan). The heavy rare earths are primarily produced in southern China (Guangdong), from ionic clays.

There are distinct differences in the elemental composition of various rare earth sources, as illustrated in Table 19-1.

TABLE 19-1 DISTRIBUTION OF RARE EARTHS BY SOURCE – CHINA
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Source	Baotou, Inner Mongolia	Sichuan	Guangdong	Longnan, Jiangxi	Mountain Pass, Ca	Mt. Weld, W. Australia ¹
Ore Type	Bastnaesite Concentrate	Bastnaesite Concentrate	High-Eu clay	High-Y clay	Bastnaesite	Monazite
TREO in Concentrate ²	50%	50%	92%	95%		
Element						
La	23	29.2	30.4	2.1	33.2	25.5
Ce	50.1	50.3	1.9	0.2	49.1	46.74
Pr	5	4.6	6.6	0.8	4.34	5.32
Nd	18	13	24.4	4.5	12	18.5
Sm	1.6	1.5	5.2	5	0.789	2.27
Eu	0.2	0.2	0.7	0.1	0.118	0.44
Gd	0.8	0.5	4.8	7.2	0.166	1
Tb	0.3	0	0.6	1	0.0159	0.07
Dy	0	0.2	3.6	7.2	0.0312	0.12
Er	0	0	1.8	4	0.0035	0.1
Y	0.2	0.5	20	62	0.0913	trace
Ho-Tm-Yb-Lu	0.8	0	0	5.9	0.0067	trace
Total TREO	100	100	100	100	99.9	100

¹Central Zone pit assays for La, Ce, Pr, Nd, Sm, Dy, Eu, and Tb

²TREO contents of China clays represent the relative amounts in concentrate produced from the clay deposits

Source: Neo-Materials International, Harben, Lynas Corp.

As a consequence of the mix of the individual elements within a raw material source, the distribution of supply of the individual elements does not match the distribution of demand for the elements. The mixed composition of rare earth minerals necessitates the production of all of the elements within a given ore source. Such production does not necessarily equal the demand for the individual oxides, leaving some in excess supply and others in deficit. Overall production of rare earths on an oxide basis is therefore typically greater than the sum of demand for the individual elements in any given year.

Total supply of rare earth oxides for 2010 was estimated at between 123,600 tonnes and 124,000 tonnes, as illustrated in Table 19-2.

TABLE 19-2 RARE EARTH SUPPLY – 2008 & 2010


Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Source	Supply 2008 (tonnes REO)	Supply 2010 (tonnes REO)
China	117,000	120,000
Others		
Recycling	~5,000	N/A
Russia	2,500 - 3,000	1,800 - 2,000
India	100	25 - 50
Mountain Pass	2,000	1,800 – 2,000
Total	121,600 - 127,100	123,600 – 124,000

Source: Roskill Information Services, 2010 & 2011

As described by Asian Metal, the international rare earths market has grown at an unprecedented rate since China cut export quotas by approximately 40% in 2011 as seen in Figure 19-1. China's overwhelming control on the rare earth supply chain, from upstream mining to downstream processing and end-user products, is likely to remain intact on all but a few materials through 2016. Further price increases are expected with continued decreases in export availability from major Chinese suppliers and a surge in domestic China demand.

FIGURE 19-1 CHINESE RARE EARTH EXPORT QUOTAS BY YEAR



A crackdown on illegal mining operations, which accounted for an estimated 20% to 25% of production over the past five years, has substantially cut down on the availability of material on the spot market. A major consolidation of the market, which began in 2009, has also limited the number of active rare earth miners, separation plants, and exporters in China.

New production from US-based Molycorp and Australia-based Lynas should add between 30,000 tons (27,000 tonnes) and 40,000 tons (36,000 tonnes) of high purity material to the market by the end of 2012, which is widely expected to saturate the light rare earths market when it becomes available. The ore bodies from Molycorp's Mountain Pass and Lynas' Mount Weld mine sites are predominantly composed of light rare earths - lanthanum, cerium, praseodymium, and neodymium. The heavy rare earths and yttrium are found at the mines only in trace amounts and will be neither recovered nor produced in quantities that would have a material impact on global supply.

It should be noted that the heavy rare earths – Dy, Er, Eu, Gd, Ho, Lu, Sc, Sm, Tb, Tm, Y, Yb – are not only much more rare than the light rare earths, but the separation and processing of heavy rare earth-rich concentrate into high purity oxides and metals outside of China will require substantial new capital investment. At present, substantially all heavy rare earth processing facilities are in China, and previous scoping studies done by prospective rare earth mining ventures indicate that a new separation plant would cost roughly US\$250 million to US\$350 million and take three to four years to complete. As a result, availability of heavy rare earths will be contingent on Chinese production levels until 2015 at the earliest - the soonest a non-Chinese processing facility could be completed.

On a macro level, over the next five years, the Chinese government is expected to further regulate the rare earth mining industry. China has already begun enacting a series of new policies designed to improve environmental guidelines, limit illegal production, establish provincial and national stockpile reserves, and continue a consolidation of the overall industry.

RARE EARTH PRICING

The market for rare earth products is relatively small, and information on pricing and sales terms, especially for 2016, is difficult to obtain. Sustained growth in demand and price is expected for nearly all rare earths through 2016 with the exception of lanthanum, cerium, and praseodymium.

REO price forecasts for 2016 were obtained from a number of sources, which covered a wide range of values. The prices used in the July 15, 2012 PEA cash flow are described in Table 19-3, below. The prices were applied as a constant throughout the Life of Mine (LOM) schedule.

TABLE 19-3 REO FORECAST PRICES VS. CURRENT SPOT PRICES
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Rare Earth Oxide	Base Case (US\$/kg)	FOB China Q2 2012 Spot* (US\$/kg)
Ce ₂ O ₃	5	25
La ₂ O ₃	10	24
Nd ₂ O ₃	75	175
Pr ₂ O ₃	75	140
Sm ₂ O ₃	9	90
Eu ₂ O ₃	500	2,300
Gd ₂ O ₃	30	100
Sc ₂ O ₃	3,000	7,200
Y ₂ O ₃	20	132
Yb ₂ O ₃	50	90
Dy ₂ O ₃	750	1,100
Er ₂ O ₃	40	195
Ho ₂ O ₃	-	-
Lu ₂ O ₃	-	-
Tb ₄ O ₇	1,500	2,000
Tm ₂ O ₃	-	-

* Source: Metal-Pages.com

The average rare earth oxide price used in the July 15, 2012 PEA is \$38/kg, while current (Q2 2012) prices average C\$99/kg.

MARKETING CONCLUSIONS

RPA considers these REO prices to be appropriate for a PEA-level study, however, we note that the recent market volatility introduces considerably more uncertainty than a comparable base or precious metals project.

CONTRACTS

No contracts relevant to the July 15, 2012 PEA have been established by Search Minerals. Search Minerals has not hedged, nor committed any of its production pursuant to an off-take agreement.

20 ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES, PERMITTING, AND SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY IMPACT

This section is taken from the July 15, 2012 PEA (Cox et al., 2012), and has not been updated to reflect the current Mineral Resource estimate contained in this report.

ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE STUDY

It is expected that a Newfoundland and Labrador Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and a Federal Comprehensive Study will be required for the Foxtrot Project. An Environmental Baseline Study (EBS) will be completed to support these environmental assessments.

To date, no EBS's have been conducted at the Foxtrot Property. An EBS is necessary to understand the specific interactions between the project and the natural environment and to design the project to avoid or minimize potential adverse effects. The EBS would also support the preparation of a registration document for the project and an EIS in the event that it is required by the province (detailed below). An EBS is typically conducted over a minimum of 12 continuous months to provide coverage of all four seasons. Studies may continue beyond this 12-month period as may be justified by the occurrence of abnormal seasonal conditions. In cases where the EBS may focus on specific information gaps the study period may be shorter than 12 months. The EBS scope is typically developed in consultation with the local and regional resource management and regulatory agencies in order to ensure agency concerns can be addressed with the study results. The initial EBS report is typically completed within 14 to 16 months of the start of the field program and the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is typically based upon this initial EBS report.

The following environmental baseline studies are likely required:

- Sound monitoring;
- Air quality;
- Historic and heritage sites;
- Fish and fish habitat baseline;

- Rare plant analysis;
- Ecological land classifications (ELC) including wildlife assemblages and wetlands; and
- Song birds.

Determination of Harmful Alteration, Disruption, or Destruction of Fish Habitat (HADD) and socio-economic baseline studies will also be undertaken.

PROJECT PROCESS AND PERMITTING

Mining projects in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador are subject to Environmental Assessment (EA) under the Newfoundland and Labrador Environmental Protection Act. They can also be subject to an environmental assessment under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA) if an approval is required from a federal agency. All provincial and federal EA processes are public. These processes are discussed below:

PROVINCIAL PROCESS

The EA process is initiated with a formal registration of the Project, submitted in a prescribed format, to the Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Environment and Conservation. The registration is made available to the public and to government agencies for review. Within 45 days of receiving a registration, the Minister will issue a decision on the proposed project. All decisions are announced in the Environmental Assessment Bulletin. There are three possible decisions:

- An Environmental Preview Report is required;
- An Environmental Impact Statement is required; or
- No further EA is required.

ENVIRONMENTAL PREVIEW REPORT

An Environmental Preview Report (EPR) is ordered by the Minister when additional information is required to determine the potential for a project to result in significant adverse environmental effects. The project proponent is responsible to prepare a project-specific EPR, in response to government-issued guidelines. The EPR is available for public and government review. At the completion of the review period, the Minister decides if the EPR is

sufficient. If not, the proponent is required to revise and/or amend it. Upon a determination of sufficiency, the Minister will release the project, conditionally release the project, or call for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

An EIS is required in cases where potential exists for a project to cause significant adverse environmental effects. The project proponent is responsible to prepare a project-specific EIS and associated component studies in response to government issued guidelines. Field work is typically required for the completion of an EIS. The component studies and EIS are available for public and government review. At the completion of the review period, the Minister decides if the component studies and/or EIS are sufficient. If not, the proponent is required to revise and/or amend the document. Upon a determination of sufficiency, Cabinet will release the project, conditionally release the project, or not release the project. Once the project is released from the EA process and prior to project construction, the proponent can proceed to obtain the necessary permits and authorizations. A release from the provincial process is valid for three years.

PERMITTING

Proponents should follow the *Environmental Guidelines for Construction and Mineral Exploration Companies* (DNR, 2011) provided by the Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Natural Resources. The *Guidebook to Exploration, Development and Mining in Newfoundland and Labrador* (GNL, 2010) also provides useful guidance on the regulatory process.

WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT

Although no water balance has been completed for the Project, the discharge of effluents is probable. Discharges may originate from several sources, including open pit dewatering, groundwater seepage, precipitation, and general site run-off, including run-off from ore, waste rock, and overburden stockpiles; and, periodic releases of water from the tailings management area. As such a water treatment plant will likely be required to manage the quality of water being discharged into the environment.

The control and management of water resources in Newfoundland and Labrador is legislated by the Water Resources Act, although related development activities cannot be permitted or

undertaken without first obtaining authorization from the Province under the Environmental Protection Act.

SURFACE WATER

Licences under the Water Resources Act will be required prior to release of any effluent. Effluents discharged to surface water from mining activities must, at minimum, comply with Sections 3, 19.1, and 20 of the MMER (Table 20-1). Site specific effluent quality criteria may be imposed as a condition of any approval in the event that compliance with the MMER does not provide adequate protection of receiving water quality. Effluent treatment is expected to be required to meet effluent quality limits for TSS, ammonia, and potentially for management of metal concentrations. Specific treatment requirements will be developed in subsequent Project planning phases.

Monitoring of any liquid discharge from the Project to receiving waters will be required as part of any provincial environmental permit or approval. The basic monitoring requirements are those detailed in the MMER, which require routine monitoring of deleterious substances (Table 20-1) and effluent volume. Periodic effluent characterization also is required, which includes the deleterious substances and analyses of alkalinity, hardness, aluminum, cadmium, iron, mercury, molybdenum, ammonia, nitrate, major anion and cation species, and Project-specific contaminants of concern (COC). The MMER also require periodic receiving water quality monitoring, and environmental effects monitoring.

Neither the process water requirement for the mill or the water source has been determined at this time, however, water usage from any natural surface water body will need to be licensed under the *Water Resources Act*.

GROUNDWATER

Hydrogeological conditions in the vicinity of the open pit need to be studied in order to estimate the potential for groundwater seepage into the pit, to design the necessary water diversion and water management works, and to assess how the Project interactions with groundwater may affect nearby surface water bodies. Any dewatering will be required to be licensed under the *Water Resources Act*.

**TABLE 20-1 METAL MINING EFFLUENT REGULATIONS, SOR/2002-222 –
AUTHORIZED LIMITS OF DELETERIOUS SUBSTANCES**
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Deleterious Substance	Maximum Authorized Monthly Mean Concentration	Maximum Authorized Concentration in a Composite Sample	Maximum Authorized Concentration in a Grab Sample
Arsenic	0.50 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	1.00 mg/L
Copper	0.30 mg/L	0.45 mg/L	0.60 mg/L
Cyanide	1.00 mg/L	1.50 mg/L	2.00 mg/L
Lead	0.20 mg/L	0.30 mg/L	0.40 mg/L
Nickel	0.50 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	1.00 mg/L
Zinc	0.50 mg/L	0.75 mg/L	1.00 mg/L
Total Suspended Solids	15.00 mg/L	22.50 mg/L	30.00 mg/L
Radium 226	0.37 Bq/L	0.74 Bq/L	1.11 Bq/L

Note: All concentrations are total values.

Cyanide only required for mines using cyanide in the metallurgical process.

Current version as posted between Apr 3, 2009 and Apr 15, 2009. SOR/2006-239, s. 25.

Source: Department of Justice 2011

OTHER PERMITS

Mining Lease

A mining lease must be obtained under the provincial *Mineral Act* for exclusive rights to develop, extract, remove, deal with, sell, mortgage, or otherwise dispose of all the unalienated materials, or those specified in the lease, in, on or under the land described in the lease (GNL, 2010),. Surface rights that include the entire footprint of the mine and related infrastructure must also be obtained under the *Mineral Act*.

Mill License

A mill license is required for operation of a mill in conjunction with a mining operation, as per Section 5 of the *Mining Act*. Mill licenses are issued by the Department of Natural Resources to the holder of a mining lease (GNL, 2010), and a mill may not be operated without first obtaining a mill license.

Fuel Storage and Handling

Fuel storage and handling in Newfoundland and Labrador is regulated by *The Storage and Handling of Gasoline & Associated Products Regulations*, and a Certificate of Approval for a fuel storage system must be obtained from the Department of Government Services and

Lands. Registration is required for all underground and above ground storage facilities for the storage and handling of fuel and associated products.

Explosives

Explosives must be stored at least 22.86 m from any road and 30.48 m from an occupied building. Explosives in excess of 68.04 kg can be kept only on premises which have been licensed under *The Explosives Act* (Canada). All transportation of explosives must conform to *The Fire Commissioners Act* and *The Explosives Act* (Canada). Permits related to explosives are often held by the explosives supplier in circumstances where the onsite storage facilities are owned and operated by the supplier.

FEDERAL PROCESS

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Any requirement for a federal environmental assessment would be conducted in accordance with the Draft Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Agreement on Environmental Assessment Cooperation (2005). The Provincial government and CEA Agency will advise proponents at the earliest opportunity about the potential for a cooperative environmental assessment of a proposed project.

CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ACT

The Project registration document will be circulated to the Canadian Environmental Assessment (CEA) Agency and to federal authorities such as Environment Canada, Health Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Natural Resources Canada and Transport Canada. The federal agencies will determine if a federal environmental assessment is necessary. A federal environmental assessment is typically triggered when a federal authority determines it must provide a license, permit or an approval that enables a project to be carried out (e.g., authorization under the federal *Fisheries Act*).

If a federal agency determines that it must issue a permit or approval for the Project, the federal agency would then determine the level of environmental assessment to be applied to the Project. The level of environmental assessment that is necessary for a mining operation in the presence of a CEAA trigger is determined by a number of factors which are outlined in the *Comprehensive Study List Regulations* under CEAA. The basic level of assessment is the screening level. The next level is the comprehensive study, which is typically applied to

larger and more complex Projects. In general, a metal mine with a planned production rate of 3,000 tpd or greater is subject to a comprehensive study.

The proposed Project is considered a natural resource development which triggers involvement of the Major Project Management Office (MPMO) to provide overarching project management for a federal environmental assessment if required. The MPMO is administered by Natural Resources Canada, whose role is to provide guidance to project proponents and other stakeholders, coordinate project agreements and timelines between federal departments and agencies, and to track and monitor the progression of major resource projects through the federal regulatory review process.

FISHERIES ACT

Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) is responsible for protecting fish and fish habitat in Canada. Under section 35(1) of the federal *Fisheries Act*, works that result in the harmful alteration, disruption or destruction (HADD) of fish habitat must be authorized in advance by DFO, (DFO 2002). If a DFO Authorization is required, it can take anywhere from one month to several years to obtain an Authorization, depending on the type of approval required, the complexity of the project, and any associated field studies. Other Project activities (e.g., construction of crossing structures [culverts] through fish habitat, any work in or about a fish-bearing watercourse that may disturb, alter or destroy fish habitat) will require an Authorization under the Fisheries Act if they result in a HADD. Habitat compensation is an option for achieving no net loss when residual impacts on habitat productive capacity are deemed harmful after relocation, redesign or mitigation options have been implemented. Habitat compensation involves replacing the lost habitat with newly created habitat or improving the productive capacity of some other natural habitat. Depending on the nature and scope of the compensatory works, habitat compensation may require (but is not limited to) five years of post-construction monitoring (DFO 2002).

PROVINCIAL AUTHORIZATIONS

Following release from the multi-jurisdictional environmental assessment process, the Project will require a number of approvals, permits, and authorizations prior to Project initiation. In addition, throughout Project construction and operation, Search Minerals will also be required to comply with any other terms and conditions associated with the release issued by the regulatory jurisdictions. Preliminary lists of permits, approvals, and authorizations that

may be required for the Project are presented in Table 20-2. Permits and authorizations will also be required from affected municipalities.

TABLE 20-2 PROVINCIAL AUTHORIZATIONS
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Permit, Approval or Authorization Activity	Issuing Agency
• Release from Environment Assessment Process	DOEC – Environmental Assessment Division
• Permit to Occupy Crown Land	DOEC – Crown Lands Division
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit to Construct a Non-Domestic Well • Water Resources Real-Time Monitoring • Certificate of Environmental Approval to Alter a Body of Water • Culvert Installation • Fording • Stream Modification or Diversion • Other works within 15 metres of a body of water (site drainage, dewater pits, settling ponds) 	DOEC – Water Resources Management Division
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certificate of Approval for Construction and Operation • Certificate of Approval for Generators • Industrial Processing Works • Approval of MMER Emergency Response Plan • Approval of Waste Management Plan • Approval of Environmental Contingency Plan (Emergency Spill Response) • Approval of Environmental Protection Plan 	DOEC – Pollution Prevention Division
• Permit to Control Nuisance Animals	DOEC – Wildlife Division
• Pesticide Operators License	DOEC – Pesticides Control Section
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blasters Safety Certificate • Magazine License • Approval for Storage and Handling Gasoline and Associated Products • Temporary Fuel Cache • Fuel Tank Registration • Approval for Used Oil Storage Tank System (Oil/Water Separator) • Fire, Life and Safety Program • Certificate of Approval for a Waste Management System 	Government Service Centre (GSC)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of Development Plan, Closure Plan, and Financial Security • Mining Lease • Surface Rights Lease • Quarry Development Permit 	Department of Natural Resources (DNR) – Mineral Lands Division
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operating Permit to Carry out an Industrial Operation During Forest Fire Season on Crown Land • Permit to Cut Crown Timber • Permit to Burn 	DNR – Forest Resources
• Storing, handling, and transportation of dangerous goods	Department of Transportation and Works

SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY REQUIREMENTS

COMMUNITY AND ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT

The implementation of an effective community and Aboriginal engagement program is fundamental to the successful environmental permitting of mining projects. The purpose of this program is to ensure that all potentially affected persons, businesses, and communities have a full understanding of the Project and an opportunity to share information with respect to concerns regarding potential effects, and so the proponent has an opportunity to explain how these concerns are addressed in the Project design and operations. This program typically begins in the early stages of project planning and continues through the life of the Project.

The community engagement phase of the Project will ideally be initiated as early as possible and requires very careful thought and planning. Evidence of community engagement is required throughout the provincial and federal environmental assessment processes. If mining plans are likely to change as the Project progresses, it is important to keep the community well informed.

Consultation with Aboriginal groups should also be initiated as early as possible.

In addition to a continuing public engagement program, it may be necessary to negotiate an impact/benefit agreement (IBA) with potentially affected stakeholder groups in order to, in part, address potential adverse effects of the Project on traditional resource users. These agreements can take many forms and no single formula is applicable to all situations. However, the agreements typically lay out various forms of economic stimulation or benefit specifically designed and intended to benefit specific affected stakeholder groups.

MINE CLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

The Rehabilitation and Closure Plan is a provincial requirement of the Newfoundland and Labrador Mining Act, Chapter M-15.1, Sections (8), (9) and (10). Under the Mining Act, the “Rehabilitation and Closure Plan” is defined as a plan which describes the process of rehabilitation of a project at any stage of the project up to and including closure. Rehabilitation is defined as measures taken to restore the property as close as is reasonably

possible to its former use or condition or to an alternate use or condition that is considered appropriate and acceptable by the Department of Natural Resources.

REHABILITATION AND CLOSURE PLAN SUBMISSION AND REVIEW

A formal Rehabilitation and Closure Plan is required to obtain approval for project development under the Mining Act. This plan is required to be submitted with or immediately following the submission of the Project Development Plan and provides the basis for the establishment of the Financial Assurance for the Project. The Mining Act requirements will only be reviewed by NLDNR following release of the project from Environmental Assessment and the review and approval process can typically take four months to one year.

The Rehabilitation and Closure Plan is directly linked to mine development and operation over the life of a mine and therefore must be considered a “live” document. It is common practice in the industry to review and revise the Rehabilitation and Closure Plan throughout the development and operational stages of the Project. The process of reviewing and updating the Plan commonly occurs on a five year cycle after the start of operations, however, the review cycle is typically established on a site by site basis. The final review of the Rehabilitation and Closure Plan generally occurs once the mine closure schedule is known (typically 12 months or more before end of mining). This final review forms a Closure Plan which defines in detail the actions necessary to achieve the Rehabilitation and Closure objectives and requirements. This Plan utilizes the actual site conditions and knowledge of the operation of the site and can therefore provide specific reference to activities and goals.

DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

OBJECTIVES OF THE REHABILITATION AND CLOSURE PLAN

There are three stages of rehabilitation activity that occur over the life of a mine:

1. Progressive rehabilitation
2. Closure rehabilitation
3. Post closure monitoring and treatment

Progressive rehabilitation is considered to include rehabilitation completed, where possible or practical, throughout the mine operation stage, prior to closure. This would include activities that would contribute to the rehabilitation effort that would otherwise be completed upon cessation of mining operations (closure rehabilitation). Closure rehabilitation would include

the measures, remaining after progressive rehabilitation activities, required to fully restore or reclaim the property as close as reasonably possible to its former condition or to an approved alternate condition. This would include demolition and removal of site infrastructure, vegetation, and all other activities required to achieve the requirements and goals detailed in the Program.

Upon completion of the closure rehabilitation activities, a period of 'post-closure monitoring' is then required to ensure that the rehabilitation activities have been successful in achieving the prescribed goals. At this stage of rehabilitation, some treatment requirements may continue until the natural baseline conditions are restored and these conditions would then persist without need for additional treatment. Once it can be demonstrated that practical rehabilitation of the site has been successful, the site should be closed-out or released by the Regulatory authority and the land relinquished to the Owner or the Crown.

The overall objectives proposed for the Project site should include:

- Restoration of the health and fertility of the land to a self-sustaining, natural state
- Provision of an agreeable habitat for wildlife (including fish) in a balanced and maintenance free ecosystem
- Creation of a landscape which is visually acceptable and compatible with surrounding terrain
- Mitigation and control to within acceptable levels, the potential sources of pollution, fire risk, and public liability
- Outline and undertake the studies and/or planning to be completed during the operations period to allow for detailed Closure planning to proceed without delay at the cessation of mining
- Provide a safe environment for long term public access

The natural and existing characteristics of the site which provide the basis for the Plan design include physical stability and chemical stability.

PHYSICAL STABILITY

The closure plan must address the physical stability aspect of the mine site components which remain after operations have ceased. In the case of the Foxtrot Project, these components will likely include the open pit, waste dumps, tailings containment dams,

overflow channels, and construction features associated with buildings and site infrastructure. The closure plan must consider the deterioration of site components over the long term, by perpetual forces such as precipitation, wind, chemical weathering, and seismic events.

CHEMICAL STABILITY:

It is necessary to ensure long-term chemical stability of the rehabilitated mine site. Design of the closure plan must contain appropriate methods to ensure that on-site water, drainage, and surface run-off from the site meet acceptable water quality standards.

NATURAL AESTHETIC REQUIREMENTS

Visual impact of the mine site is an important consideration in terms of its existing non-compatibility with the surrounding landscape. The Plan will ultimately result in the removal and/or capping, and vegetation of the majority of the physical features and structures associated with operations.

VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE

Closure plan design must ensure that vegetation will be self-sustaining over the long term by being compatible with on-site soil and local climatic conditions. Establishment of vegetation should facilitate the natural recovery of the area for use by local wildlife.

Closure plan should ensure that disturbed areas of the site requiring rehabilitation, such as roadways, building foundation areas, storage pads and storage area bases, are suitably prepared either by scarification to loosen the soil, and/or loosened and covered with a cap of local till prior to vegetation. Concrete structures and foundations will be removed or buried under a suitable cover of till to permit vegetation growth.

Vegetation will be established through proper site preparation and encouragement of natural vegetation or planting. The selected method will depend upon location of the disturbed area, anticipated time for natural succession and the requirement for immediate erosion and sedimentation control through provision of a vegetation cover. In all cases, the primary objective of vegetation is to stabilize the soil against erosional forces of both wind and water, and provide a naturally sustainable surface cover.

WATER MANAGEMENT

The closure plan will consider water management issues related to:

- Control and mitigation of drainage issues from surface waste materials
- The long term fate of discharges of process water from the mill, drainage from the mine, sanitary sewage, and other wastewater from the site infrastructure following closure of the mine
- Control and mitigation of discharge water from the mine tailings disposal area following closure of the mine
- Site drainage and surface run-off for the mine site to control erosion, sedimentation, and the degradation of adjacent water courses.

The overall objective of the water management within the closure plan is to minimize any impact to the water resources on site and surrounding area. Integrated water management, including monitoring of surface and groundwater resources, will be used to ensure that water quality is maintained within guideline levels without creating the requirement for long term water treatment.

LONG TERM LAND USE

The closure plan must consider long term land use for the mine site that is sustainable and compatible with local and regional topography, soil and climatic conditions.

Other land use options, such as agricultural and commercial/industrial are not considered viable at this time. However, natural vegetation of the site is expected to permit managed forestry activity and recreational activity to resume.

Final closure planning would be based on the current CCME soil quality guidelines to industrial classification.

While RPA has not completed a closure plan for the Project, an allowance of \$19 million was included in the July 15, 2012 PEA cash flow. This estimate is based on comparison to similar projects.

21 CAPITAL AND OPERATING COSTS

This section is taken from the July 15, 2012 PEA (Cox et al., 2012), and has not been updated to reflect the current Mineral Resource estimate contained in this report.

CAPITAL COST ESTIMATES

SUMMARY

The mine, mill, and site infrastructure costs are summarized in Table 21-1. All costs in this section are in 2012 Canadian dollars unless otherwise specified.

TABLE 21-1 CAPITAL COST SUMMARY
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Cost Area	Initial (C\$ million)	Sustaining (C\$ million)
Surface Infrastructure	41.0	3.7
Mining	36.7	9.3
Processing	138.4	6.1
Tailings	29.1	10.0
Owners/Indirect Costs	61.3	0.0
Rehabilitation & Mine Closure	0.0	19.0
EPCM	36.8	0.0
Contingency	103.0	0.0
Total	446.3	48.1

For the purpose of the economic analysis, the total capital cost which includes initial and sustaining capital costs is \$494.4 million.

Capital costs were estimated using cost models, unit prices, suppliers' budget quotes, preliminary designs, general industry knowledge and experience, and other information from recent similar Projects. The expected accuracy on cost estimates is $\pm 35\%$, which is typical of a PEA study.

Engineering, procurement, and construction management (EPCM), and contingency for all capital cost components vary depending on cost area. In order to estimate these components, specific factors were applied. A 15% factor for EPCM and a 30% factor for

contingency were applied to initial direct capital costs. The capital cost totals for EPCM and contingency are \$36.8 million and \$103.0 million, respectively.

SURFACE INFRASTRUCTURE

Surface infrastructure costs include general site preparation, construction of on-site roads, buildings construction, equipment and furniture, power distribution, fluid pumping networks, fuel storage and distribution, and fire protection. Surface infrastructure capital costs are shown in Table 21-2.

TABLE 21-2 SURFACE INFRASTRUCTURE CAPITAL
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Cost Area	Initial (C\$ million)
Public Road Access to St-Lewis	0.8
St-Lewis Harbor upgrading	1.0
St-Lewis Airport upgrading	2.5
Site Preparation (Civil Work)	2.5
Pumping Stations	2.5
Administration and Services Office	5.0
Garage, Shops, Warehouse and Cold Shed	6.0
Accommodation Camp	13.0
Concrete Plant	1.5
Mobile Equipment	0.7
Site preparation Explosive Magazine	0.2
Diesel tank and distribution	1.5
Genset and Electrical Distribution	3.8
Total	41.0

Sustaining capital for surface infrastructure was estimated at \$410,000 annually, which totals to \$3.7 million over the LOM.

MINING

Mining capital costs include mining equipment fleet purchases, open pit site preparation, waste pile and ore stockpile preparation, ditches and hauling roads from open pit to ROM pad and waste dump and other related installations.

Equipment is the most expensive cost item of the mine capital. Mine fleet was estimated based on open pit operations of a similar scale. The truck, shovel, loader and drill requirements alone were estimated using mineralized material and waste cycle times, the shovel's truck service times, and drill penetration rate and productivities. Most equipment costs were obtained from suppliers on the basis of budget quotes.

Mining capital costs are summarized in Table 21-3.

TABLE 21-3 MINING CAPITAL COST
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Cost Area	Initial (C\$ million)
Equipment	31.5
Open pit site preparation and ditches	1.2
Waste pile site preparation and ditches	2.5
Ore stockpile preparation and ditches	0.3
Hauling roads and ditches	1.2
Total	36.7

The sustaining capital for mining is estimated to be \$9.3 million over the LOM. This includes \$53,000 annually for open pit mine site preparation, and \$2.2 million every two years to cover the replacement of the mining fleet during LOM.

PROCESSING FACILITY

The overall processing facilities as shown in the process flowsheet (Section 17, Figure 17-1) are estimated at \$138.4 million, utilizing similar factored plant costs. This estimate includes equipment, materials, electrical, and construction.

TABLE 21-4 PROCESSING FACILITY CAPITAL COST
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Cost Area	Initial (C\$ million)
Total	138.4

Overall plant sustaining capital is estimated at \$6.1 million dollars over the LOM.

TAILINGS STORAGE FACILITY

The TSF capital cost is estimated at \$29.1 million as seen in Table 21-5 and is based on facilities with similar storage requirement.

TABLE 21-5 TAILINGS STORAGE FACILITY CAPITAL COST
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Cost Area	Initial (C\$ million)
Total	29.1

Sustaining capital for the TSF totals \$10.0 million over the LOM and includes \$4.0 million in year three and year six and \$2 million in year nine.

OWNER'S AND INDIRECT COSTS

Indirect costs consist of warehouse inventory (spare parts) and mill start-up/commissioning. Owner's costs are operating costs that occur during the pre-production period. The costs generally comprise general and administrative and labour expenses.

In order to estimate Indirect and Owners' capital costs, a factor of 40% was applied to initial direct capital, similar to how EPCM and contingency estimates were derived. From RPA's experience this factor represents a consistent proportion of indirect capital costs to direct capital costs for operating projects. Applying this factor, indirect and owner's costs are estimated to be \$61.3 million.

CLOSURE AND RECLAMATION

A cost allowance of \$19 million was made for closure and reclamation of the tailings storage facility and mine site. It was assumed that equipment sales would pay for buildings demolition.

EXCLUSIONS

The following is excluded from the capital costs estimate:

- Project financing and interest charges
- Escalation during the Project
- Permits, fees and process royalties
- Pre-feasibility and Feasibility studies
- Environmental impact studies
- Any additional civil, concrete work due to the adverse soil condition and location

- Taxes
- Import duties and custom fees
- Cost of geotechnical and geomechanical investigations
- Cost of hydrogeology investigations
- Rock mechanics study
- Metallurgical testwork
- Exploration drilling
- Costs of fluctuations in currency exchanges
- Project application and approval expenses.

OPERATING COST ESTIMATES

SUMMARY

Mine life average operating unit costs for the Project are shown in Table 21-6. Details on individual operating costs will be provided in the following sections.

TABLE 21-6 UNIT OPERATING COSTS SUMMARY
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Cost area	LOM Unit Cost (C\$/t milled)	LOM Unit Cost (C\$/t moved)
Mining (Owner/Contractor)	35.64	4.24
Processing	52.50	
G&A	8.12	
Total operating cost	96.26	

MINING

Mine operating costs were estimated using cost models, unit prices, suppliers' budget quotes, general knowledge and experience, preliminary designs, and other information from recent similar projects. The expected accuracy on cost estimates is of PEA study level ($\pm 35\%$).

The owner unit mining cost was estimated to be \$3.95/t moved including an extra cost of \$0.78/t moved attributed to the fly-in/fly-out schedule (\$0.31/t moved) and extra cost of energy power supplied by diesel driven generators (Genset) versus hydroelectric (\$0.47/t moved).

The contractor unit mining cost was estimated to \$5.00/t moved, it is an increase of 44% from owner mining cost attributed to fixed cost for overhead, supervision, security and profit,

and room and board for contractor's workers. For the LOM the weighted average mining cost will be \$4.24/t moved.

PROCESSING FACILITY

Process operating costs are estimated at \$52.50 per tonne milled and is presented in Table 21-7. The cost is estimated from similar rare earth projects in similar geopolitical jurisdictions and includes consideration for diesel power generation, maintenance, reagents and other consumables.

TABLE 21-7 BREAKDOWN OF MILL OPERATING COST
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Cost area	Unit Cost (C\$/t milled)
Total processing cost	52.50

GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATION

G&A comprise the cost of administration services and staff, as well as management, human resources for engineering, geology, environment, and construction. The remaining costs are for material and supplies, some consultants, insurance and taxes, and communications. G&A has been estimated at \$11.6 million per year or \$8.12/t milled (based on 1.44 Mtpa).

MANPOWER

Manpower estimates are based on typical manpower requirements for open pit operations of similar scale, similar fly-in/fly-out schedule, and in similar geopolitical jurisdictions. Manpower estimates for the various administrative units are shown in Table 21-8.

TABLE 21-8 MANPOWER SUMMARY
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Unit	Operation	Maintenance	Supervision and Services	Total
Administration	-	-	30	30
Mine Owner	82	22	18	122
Mine Contractor	68	-	4	72
Mill and Surface	70	38	12	120
Total	220	60	64	344

22 ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

The economic analysis section is taken from the July 15, 2012 PEA (Cox et al., 2012), and is based on the Mineral Resource estimate at that time. The economic analysis has not been updated to reflect the updated Mineral Resource estimate contained in this report.

RPA conducted an economic analysis of the Foxtrot Project applying operating and capital costs estimates based on a 10 year production schedule.

The economic analysis shows that, at an average TREO basket price of \$38 per kilogram TREO, the project yields pre-tax net NPV at a 10% discount rate of \$408 million. Total pre-tax undiscounted cash flow is \$1.1 billion.

The total life-of-mine capital is approximately \$494 million, including approximately \$103 million in contingency capital. The average operating cost over the life of the project is approximately \$96.26 per tonne milled.

The Foxtrot Project will process an average of 1,440,000 t annually at an average grade of 0.58% TREE, and produce an average of 6.5 million kilograms of payable rare earth material per year.

Over the life of mine, the pre-tax Internal Rate of Return is 28.5% with a payback period of approximately 2.8 years.

The July 15, 2012 PEA is considered by RPA to meet the requirements of a PEA as defined in Canadian NI 43-101 regulations. The economic analysis from the PEA is based, in part, on Inferred Resources, and is preliminary in nature. Inferred Resources are considered too geologically speculative to have mining and economic considerations applied to them and to be categorized as Mineral Reserves. There is no certainty that the reserves development, production, and economic forecasts on which the July 15, 2012 PEA was based will be realized.

ECONOMIC CRITERIA

REVENUE

- 4,000 tonnes per day processing rate
- Average REE recovery of 79%
- Average TREO basket price of \$38 per kg
- LREE Separation charge of \$5 per kg
- HREE separation charge of \$30 per kg
- Revenue is recognized at the time of production.

COSTS

- Pre-production period: two years
- Mine life: ten years
- Life of Mine production plan as summarized in Table 16-1
- Mine life capital totals \$494 million including contingency
- Average operating cost over the mine life is \$96.26 per tonne milled

TABLE 22-1 PRE-TAX CASH FLOW SUMMARY
Search Minerals Inc. - Foxtrot Project

	Input	Units	Total/Avg	2014 -2	2015 -1	2016 1	2017 2	2018 3	2019 4	2020 5	2021 6	2022 7	2023 8	2024 9	2025 10	2026 11	2027 12
Mining																	
Mined Ore by Owner		tonnes	14,279,000			1,368,000	1,440,000	1,440,000	1,440,000	1,440,000	1,440,000	1,440,000	1,440,000	1,440,000	1,391,000		
Mined Waste by Owner		tonnes	73,010,395			2,681,290	8,515,255	8,640,000	8,640,000	8,640,000	8,640,000	9,070,675	7,211,753	6,226,836	4,744,557		
Mined Waste by Contractor		tonnes	32,827,550			-	5,629,165	5,629,165	5,629,165	5,629,165	5,629,165	5,629,165	5,629,165	5,629,165	5,629,165		
Total Material Moved		tonnes	120,116,886			4,049,290	9,955,255	15,709,165	19,882,565	19,531,228	18,024,562	10,510,675	8,651,753	7,666,836	6,135,557		
Waste to Ore ratio		---	7.41			1.96	5.91	9.91	12.81	12.56	11.52	6.30	5.01	4.32	3.41		
Processing																	
Ore to Mill		000 tonnes tpd	14,279	-	-	1,368 3,909	1,440 4,114	1,440 4,114	1,440 4,114	1,440 4,114	1,440 4,114	1,440 4,114	1,440 4,114	1,440 4,114	1,391 3,974		
Head Grade																	
Scandium	1.8	ppm	1.8			1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8		
Yttrium	721.4	ppm	721.4			721.4	721.4	721.4	721.4	721.4	721.4	721.4	721.4	721.4	721.4		
Lanthanum	1,081.8	ppm	1,081.8			1,081.8	1,081.8	1,081.8	1,081.8	1,081.8	1,081.8	1,081.8	1,081.8	1,081.8	1,081.8		
Cerium	2,185.7	ppm	2,185.7			2,185.7	2,185.7	2,185.7	2,185.7	2,185.7	2,185.7	2,185.7	2,185.7	2,185.7	2,185.7		
Praseodymium	250.6	ppm	250.6			250.6	250.6	250.6	250.6	250.6	250.6	250.6	250.6	250.6	250.6		
Neodymium	934.4	ppm	934.4			934.4	934.4	934.4	934.4	934.4	934.4	934.4	934.4	934.4	934.4		
Samarium	168.3	ppm	168.3			168.3	168.3	168.3	168.3	168.3	168.3	168.3	168.3	168.3	168.3		
Europium	8.1	ppm	8.1			8.1	8.1	8.1	8.1	8.1	8.1	8.1	8.1	8.1	8.1		
Gadolinium	135.5	ppm	135.5			135.5	135.5	135.5	135.5	135.5	135.5	135.5	135.5	135.5	135.5		
Terbium	22.1	ppm	22.1			22.1	22.1	22.1	22.1	22.1	22.1	22.1	22.1	22.1	22.1		
Dysprosium	128.4	ppm	128.4			128.4	128.4	128.4	128.4	128.4	128.4	128.4	128.4	128.4	128.4		
Holmium	24.7	ppm	24.7			24.7	24.7	24.7	24.7	24.7	24.7	24.7	24.7	24.7	24.7		
Erbium	70.2	ppm	70.2			70.2	70.2	70.2	70.2	70.2	70.2	70.2	70.2	70.2	70.2		
Thulium	10.2	ppm	10.2			10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2		
Ytterbium	64.2	ppm	64.2			64.2	64.2	64.2	64.2	64.2	64.2	64.2	64.2	64.2	64.2		
Lutetium	9.6	ppm	9.6			9.6	9.6	9.6	9.6	9.6	9.6	9.6	9.6	9.6	9.6		
Zirconium	7,110.7	ppm	7,110.7			7,110.7	7,110.7	7,110.7	7,110.7	7,110.7	7,110.7	7,110.7	7,110.7	7,110.7	7,110.7		
Niobium	471.0	ppm	471.0			471.0	471.0	471.0	471.0	471.0	471.0	471.0	471.0	471.0	471.0		
Uranium	20.4	ppm	20.4			20.4	20.4	20.4	20.4	20.4	20.4	20.4	20.4	20.4	20.4		
REE Grade		ppm	4,620.8			4,620.8	4,620.8	4,620.8	4,620.8	4,620.8	4,620.8	4,620.8	4,620.8	4,620.8	4,620.8		
HREE Grade		ppm	1,194.4			1,194.4	1,194.4	1,194.4	1,194.4	1,194.4	1,194.4	1,194.4	1,194.4	1,194.4	1,194.4		
Total REE Grade		ppm	5,815.2			5,815.2	5,815.2	5,815.2	5,815.2	5,815.2	5,815.2	5,815.2	5,815.2	5,815.2	5,815.2		
Average Recovery			13,419.1			13,419.1	13,419.1	13,419.1	13,419.1	13,419.1	13,419.1	13,419.1	13,419.1	13,419.1	13,419.1		
Scandium	no info	%	0.0%			no info	no info	no info	no info	no info	no info	no info	no info	no info	no info		
Yttrium	79.5%	%	79.5%			79.5%	79.5%	79.5%	79.5%	79.5%	79.5%	79.5%	79.5%	79.5%	79.5%		
Lanthanum	81.9%	%	81.9%			81.9%	81.9%	81.9%	81.9%	81.9%	81.9%	81.9%	81.9%	81.9%	81.9%		
Cerium	78.9%	%	78.9%			78.9%	78.9%	78.9%	78.9%	78.9%	78.9%	78.9%	78.9%	78.9%	78.9%		
Praseodymium	82.3%	%	82.3%			82.3%	82.3%	82.3%	82.3%	82.3%	82.3%	82.3%	82.3%	82.3%	82.3%		
Neodymium	77.7%	%	77.7%			77.7%	77.7%	77.7%	77.7%	77.7%	77.7%	77.7%	77.7%	77.7%	77.7%		
Samarium	80.1%	%	80.1%			80.1%	80.1%	80.1%	80.1%	80.1%	80.1%	80.1%	80.1%	80.1%	80.1%		
Europium	79.5%	%	79.5%			79.5%	79.5%	79.5%	79.5%	79.5%	79.5%	79.5%	79.5%	79.5%	79.5%		
Gadolinium	78.6%	%	78.6%			78.6%	78.6%	78.6%	78.6%	78.6%	78.6%	78.6%	78.6%	78.6%	78.6%		
Terbium	78.3%	%	78.3%			78.3%	78.3%	78.3%	78.3%	78.3%	78.3%	78.3%	78.3%	78.3%	78.3%		
Dysprosium	77.3%	%	77.3%			77.3%	77.3%	77.3%	77.3%	77.3%	77.3%	77.3%	77.3%	77.3%	77.3%		
Holmium	77.5%	%	77.5%			77.5%	77.5%	77.5%	77.5%	77.5%	77.5%	77.5%	77.5%	77.5%	77.5%		
Erbium	77.6%	%	77.6%			77.6%	77.6%	77.6%	77.6%	77.6%	77.6%	77.6%	77.6%	77.6%	77.6%		
Thulium	77.8%	%	77.8%			77.8%	77.8%	77.8%	77.8%	77.8%	77.8%	77.8%	77.8%	77.8%	77.8%		
Ytterbium	77.6%	%	77.6%			77.6%	77.6%	77.6%	77.6%	77.6%	77.6%	77.6%	77.6%	77.6%	77.6%		
Lutetium	77.7%	%	77.7%			77.7%	77.7%	77.7%	77.7%	77.7%	77.7%	77.7%	77.7%	77.7%	77.7%		
Zirconium	0.0%	%	0.0%			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Niobium	0.0%	%	0.0%			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Uranium	79.6%	%	79.6%			79.6%	79.6%	79.6%	79.6%	79.6%	79.6%	79.6%	79.6%	79.6%	79.6%		
Total REE Average Recovery			79.3%			79.3%	79.3%	79.3%	79.3%	79.3%	79.3%	79.3%	79.3%	79.3%	79.3%		
Concentrate Weight Recovery	38.5%		79.3%			38.5%	38.5%	38.5%	38.5%	38.5%	38.5%	38.5%	38.5%	38.5%	38.5%		
Concentrate Tonnage		000 tonnes	5,495			526	554	554	554	554	554	554	554	554	535		
Concentrate Grades																	
Scandium		ppm				1,491	1,491	1,491	1,491	1,491	1,491	1,491	1,491	1,491	1,491		
Yttrium		ppm	1,491			2,302	2,302	2,302	2,302	2,302	2,302	2,302	2,302	2,302	2,302		
Lanthanum		ppm	2,302			4,478	4,478	4,478	4,478	4,478	4,478	4,478	4,478	4,478	4,478		
Cerium		ppm	4,478			536	536	536	536	536	536	536	536	536	536		
Praseodymium		ppm	536			1,887	1,887	1,887	1,887	1,887	1,887	1,887	1,887	1,887	1,887		
Neodymium		ppm	1,887			350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350		
Samarium		ppm	350			17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17		
Europium		ppm	17			277	277	277	277	277	277	277	277	277	277		
Gadolinium		ppm	277			45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45		
Terbium		ppm	45			258	258	258	258	258	258	258	258	258	258		
Dysprosium		ppm	258			50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50		
Holmium		ppm	50			142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142		
Erbium		ppm	142			21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21		
Thulium		ppm	21			129	129	129	129	129	129	129	129	129	129		
Ytterbium		ppm	129			19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19		
Lutetium		ppm	19			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Zirconium		ppm	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Niobium		ppm	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Uranium		ppm	42			42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42		
Material Recovered																	
Scandium		kg	-			784,714	826,015	826,015	826,015	826,015	826,015	826,015	826,015	826,015	797,907		
Yttrium		kg	8,190,737			12,181,882	12,755,676	12,755,676	12,755,676	12,755,676	12,755,676	12,755,676	12,755,676	12,755,676	12,332,267		
Lanthanum		kg	12,649,566			23,567,778	24,811,731	24,811,731	24,811,731	24,811,731	24,811,731	24,811,731	24,811,731	24,811,731	23,997,283		
Cerium		kg	24,608,778			282,039	296,883	296,883	296,883	296,883	296,883	296,883	296,883	296,883	286,781		
Praseodymium		kg	2,943,882			993,335	1,045,616	1,045,616	1,045,616	1,045,616	1,045,616	1,045,616	1,045,616	1,045,616	1,010,036		
Neodymium		kg	10,368,299			1,924,567	1,940,088	1,940,088	1,940,088	1,940,088	1,940,088	1,940,088	1,940,088	1,940,088	1,874,483		
Samarium		kg	1,924,567			8,811	9,275	9,275	9,275	9,275	9,275	9,275	9,275	9,275	8,959		
Europium		kg	91,967			152,079											

TABLE 22-1 PRE-TAX CASH FLOW SUMMARY
Search Minerals Inc. - Foxtrot Project

	Input	Units	Total/Avg.	2014 -2	2015 -1	2016 1	2017 2	2018 3	2019 4	2020 5	2021 6	2022 7	2023 8	2024 9	2025 10	2026 11	2027 12
Revenue																	
Payable REEs																	
Scandium		kg															
Yttrium		kg	8,190,737			784,714	826,015	826,015	826,015	826,015	826,015	826,015	826,015	826,015	826,015	797,907	
Lanthanum		kg	12,649,566			1,211,892	1,275,676	1,275,676	1,275,676	1,275,676	1,275,676	1,275,676	1,275,676	1,275,676	1,275,676	1,232,267	
Cerium		kg	24,608,778			2,357,645	2,481,731	2,481,731	2,481,731	2,481,731	2,481,731	2,481,731	2,481,731	2,481,731	2,481,731	2,397,283	
Praseodymium		kg	2,943,882			282,039	296,883	296,883	296,883	296,883	296,883	296,883	296,883	296,883	296,883	296,883	
Neodymium		kg	10,368,299			993,335	1,045,616	1,045,616	1,045,616	1,045,616	1,045,616	1,045,616	1,045,616	1,045,616	1,045,616	1,010,036	
Samarium		kg	1,924,567			184,383	194,088	194,088	194,088	194,088	194,088	194,088	194,088	194,088	194,088	187,483	
Europium		kg	91,967			8,811	9,275	9,275	9,275	9,275	9,275	9,275	9,275	9,275	9,275	8,959	
Gadolinium		kg	1,520,079			153,296	153,296	153,296	153,296	153,296	153,296	153,296	153,296	153,296	153,296	148,080	
Terbium		kg	247,025			23,666	24,912	24,912	24,912	24,912	24,912	24,912	24,912	24,912	24,912	24,064	
Dysprosium		kg	1,417,786			135,831	142,980	142,980	142,980	142,980	142,980	142,980	142,980	142,980	142,980	138,115	
Holmium		kg	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Erbium		kg	778,002			74,536	78,459	78,459	78,459	78,459	78,459	78,459	78,459	78,459	78,459	75,790	
Thulium		kg	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Ytterbium		kg	711,506			68,166	71,754	71,754	71,754	71,754	71,754	71,754	71,754	71,754	71,754	69,312	
Lutetium		kg	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Zirconium		kg	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Niobium		kg	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Uranium		kg	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Total Payable Material		kg	65,452,195			6,270,649	6,600,684	6,600,684	6,600,684	6,600,684	6,600,684	6,600,684	6,600,684	6,600,684	6,600,684	6,376,077	
Market Prices																	
Sc ₂ O ₃		US\$/kg	\$ -			\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	
Y ₂ O ₃		US\$/kg	\$ 20.00			\$ 20	\$ 20	\$ 20	\$ 20	\$ 20	\$ 20	\$ 20	\$ 20	\$ 20	\$ 20	\$ 20	
La ₂ O ₃		US\$/kg	\$ 10.00			\$ 10	\$ 10	\$ 10	\$ 10	\$ 10	\$ 10	\$ 10	\$ 10	\$ 10	\$ 10	\$ 10	
Ce ₂ O ₃		US\$/kg	\$ 5.00			\$ 5	\$ 5	\$ 5	\$ 5	\$ 5	\$ 5	\$ 5	\$ 5	\$ 5	\$ 5	\$ 5	
Pr ₂ O ₃		US\$/kg	\$ 75.00			\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	
Nd ₂ O ₃		US\$/kg	\$ 75.00			\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 75	
Sm ₂ O ₃		US\$/kg	\$ 9.00			\$ 9	\$ 9	\$ 9	\$ 9	\$ 9	\$ 9	\$ 9	\$ 9	\$ 9	\$ 9	\$ 9	
Eu ₂ O ₃		US\$/kg	\$ 500.00			\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	
Gd ₂ O ₃		US\$/kg	\$ 30.00			\$ 30	\$ 30	\$ 30	\$ 30	\$ 30	\$ 30	\$ 30	\$ 30	\$ 30	\$ 30	\$ 30	
Tb ₂ O ₃		US\$/kg	\$ 1,500.00			\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	
Dy ₂ O ₃		US\$/kg	\$ 750.00			\$ 750	\$ 750	\$ 750	\$ 750	\$ 750	\$ 750	\$ 750	\$ 750	\$ 750	\$ 750	\$ 750	
Ho ₂ O ₃		US\$/kg	\$ -			\$ 65	\$ 65	\$ 65	\$ 65	\$ 65	\$ 65	\$ 65	\$ 65	\$ 65	\$ 65	\$ 65	
Er ₂ O ₃		US\$/kg	\$ 40.00			\$ 40	\$ 40	\$ 40	\$ 40	\$ 40	\$ 40	\$ 40	\$ 40	\$ 40	\$ 40	\$ 40	
Tm ₂ O ₃		US\$/kg	\$ -			\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	
Yb ₂ O ₃		US\$/kg	\$ 50.00			\$ 50	\$ 50	\$ 50	\$ 50	\$ 50	\$ 50	\$ 50	\$ 50	\$ 50	\$ 50	\$ 50	
Lu ₂ O ₃		US\$/kg	\$ -			\$ 320	\$ 320	\$ 320	\$ 320	\$ 320	\$ 320	\$ 320	\$ 320	\$ 320	\$ 320	\$ 320	
ZrO ₂		US\$/kg	\$ -			\$ 4	\$ 4	\$ 4	\$ 4	\$ 4	\$ 4	\$ 4	\$ 4	\$ 4	\$ 4	\$ 4	
Nb ₂ O ₅		US\$/kg	\$ -			\$ 55	\$ 55	\$ 55	\$ 55	\$ 55	\$ 55	\$ 55	\$ 55	\$ 55	\$ 55	\$ 55	
U ₃ O ₈		US\$/kg	\$ -			\$ 70	\$ 70	\$ 70	\$ 70	\$ 70	\$ 70	\$ 70	\$ 70	\$ 70	\$ 70	\$ 70	
Gross Revenue																	
Scandium		US\$/kg	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Yttrium		US\$/kg	\$ 208,035			\$ 19,931	\$ 20,980	\$ 20,980	\$ 20,980	\$ 20,980	\$ 20,980	\$ 20,980	\$ 20,980	\$ 20,980	\$ 20,980	\$ 20,980	
Lanthanum		US\$/kg	\$ 148,351			\$ 14,213	\$ 14,961	\$ 14,961	\$ 14,961	\$ 14,961	\$ 14,961	\$ 14,961	\$ 14,961	\$ 14,961	\$ 14,961	\$ 14,961	
Cerium		US\$/kg	\$ 151,144			\$ 14,480	\$ 15,242	\$ 15,242	\$ 15,242	\$ 15,242	\$ 15,242	\$ 15,242	\$ 15,242	\$ 15,242	\$ 15,242	\$ 15,242	
Praseodymium		US\$/kg	\$ 296,775			\$ 25,558	\$ 26,901	\$ 26,901	\$ 26,901	\$ 26,901	\$ 26,901	\$ 26,901	\$ 26,901	\$ 26,901	\$ 26,901	\$ 26,901	
Neodymium		US\$/kg	\$ 907,006			\$ 86,896	\$ 91,469	\$ 91,469	\$ 91,469	\$ 91,469	\$ 91,469	\$ 91,469	\$ 91,469	\$ 91,469	\$ 91,469	\$ 91,469	
Samarium		US\$/kg	\$ 20,086			\$ 1,924	\$ 2,026	\$ 2,026	\$ 2,026	\$ 2,026	\$ 2,026	\$ 2,026	\$ 2,026	\$ 2,026	\$ 2,026	\$ 2,026	
Europium		US\$/kg	\$ 53,245			\$ 5,101	\$ 5,370	\$ 5,370	\$ 5,370	\$ 5,370	\$ 5,370	\$ 5,370	\$ 5,370	\$ 5,370	\$ 5,370	\$ 5,370	
Gadolinium		US\$/kg	\$ 52,562			\$ 5,036	\$ 5,301	\$ 5,301	\$ 5,301	\$ 5,301	\$ 5,301	\$ 5,301	\$ 5,301	\$ 5,301	\$ 5,301	\$ 5,301	
Terbium		US\$/kg	\$ 435,818			\$ 41,754	\$ 43,951	\$ 43,951	\$ 43,951	\$ 43,951	\$ 43,951	\$ 43,951	\$ 43,951	\$ 43,951	\$ 43,951	\$ 43,951	
Dysprosium		US\$/kg	\$ 1,220,381			\$ 116,919	\$ 123,072	\$ 123,072	\$ 123,072	\$ 123,072	\$ 123,072	\$ 123,072	\$ 123,072	\$ 123,072	\$ 123,072	\$ 123,072	
Holmium		US\$/kg	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Erbium		US\$/kg	\$ 35,585			\$ 3,409	\$ 3,589	\$ 3,589	\$ 3,589	\$ 3,589	\$ 3,589	\$ 3,589	\$ 3,589	\$ 3,589	\$ 3,589	\$ 3,589	
Thulium		US\$/kg	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Ytterbium		US\$/kg	\$ 40,509			\$ 3,881	\$ 4,085	\$ 4,085	\$ 4,085	\$ 4,085	\$ 4,085	\$ 4,085	\$ 4,085	\$ 4,085	\$ 4,085	\$ 4,085	
Lutetium		US\$/kg	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Zirconium		US\$/kg	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Niobium		US\$/kg	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Uranium		US\$/kg	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Total Gross Revenue		US\$/kg	\$ 3,539,474			\$ 339,099	\$ 356,947	\$ 356,947	\$ 356,947	\$ 356,947	\$ 356,947	\$ 356,947	\$ 356,947	\$ 356,947	\$ 356,947	\$ 344,801	
Exchange Rate		\$/US\$				1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Gross Revenue		US\$/kg	\$ 3,539,474			\$ 339,099	\$ 356,947	\$ 356,947	\$ 356,947	\$ 356,947	\$ 356,947	\$ 356,947	\$ 356,947	\$ 356,947	\$ 356,947	\$ 344,801	
TREO Gross Revenue Basket Price		\$/kg	\$ 54			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Offsite Costs																	
LREE Separation	\$5	US\$/kg	\$ 366,737			\$ 35,135	\$ 36,984	\$ 36,984	\$ 36,984	\$ 36,984	\$ 36,984	\$ 36,984	\$ 36,984	\$ 36,984	\$ 36,984	\$ 35,726	
HREE Separation	\$30	US\$/kg	\$ 167,084			\$ 16,008	\$ 16,850	\$ 16,850	\$ 16,850	\$ 16,850	\$ 16,850	\$ 16,850	\$ 16,850	\$ 16,850	\$ 16,850	\$ 16,277	
Total		US\$/kg	\$ 533,822			\$ 51,143	\$ 53,835	\$ 53,835	\$ 53,835	\$ 53,835	\$ 53,835	\$ 53,835	\$ 53,835	\$ 53,835	\$ 53,835	\$ 52,003	
Offsite Costs to Gross Revenue		%	15%			15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	
NSR Royalty	0%	US\$/kg	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Net Revenue		US\$/kg	\$ 3,005,652			\$ 287,957	\$ 303,112	\$ 303,112	\$ 303,112	\$ 303,112	\$ 303,112	\$ 303,112	\$ 303,112	\$ 303,112	\$ 303,112	\$ 292,798	
NSR		US\$/kg	\$ 210			\$ 210	\$ 210	\$ 210	\$ 210	\$ 210	\$ 210	\$ 210	\$ 210	\$ 210	\$ 210	\$ 210	
TREO Net Revenue Basket Price		\$/kg	\$ 38			\$ 38	\$ 38	\$ 38	\$ 38	\$ 38	\$ 38	\$ 38	\$ 38	\$ 38	\$ 38	\$ 38	
Operating Costs																	
Mining by Owner	\$ 3.95	US\$/kg	\$ 3.95			\$ 3.95	\$ 3.95	\$ 3.95	\$ 3.95	\$ 3.95	\$ 3.95	\$ 3.95	\$ 3.95	\$ 3.95	\$ 3.95	\$ 3.95	
Mining by Contractor	\$ 5.00	US\$/kg	\$ 5.00			\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00</						

SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

Project risks can be identified in both economic and non-economic terms. Key economic risks were examined by running cash flow sensitivities on:

- Head Grade;
- Recovery;
- Rare Earth Oxide Prices;
- Operating Cost Per Tonne Milled, and
- Capital Cost.

The rare earths price sensitivity is based on results using a rare earth oxide base case price forecast, which equates to a \$38/kg net revenue basket price.

The pre-tax NPV (at 10%) sensitivity analysis has been calculated for -20% to +20% variations. The sensitivities are shown in Table 22-2, Figure 22-1 and Figure 22-2. The NPV is most sensitive to rare earth oxide prices, followed by head grade and metallurgical recovery.

TABLE 22-2 SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Sensitivity to Head Grade

TREE (%)	NPV @ 10% Million	IRR
0.47	\$103	15%
0.52	\$256	22%
0.58	\$408	28%
0.64	\$561	34%
0.70	\$713	40%

Sensitivity to Recovery

REC%	NPV @ 10% Million	IRR
63.4%	\$103	15%
71.4%	\$256	22%
79.3%	\$408	28%
81.3%	\$446	30%
83.3%	\$484	31%

Sensitivity to TREO Basket Price

TREO C\$/kg	NPV @ 10% Million	IRR
\$29	\$49	13%
\$34	\$229	21%
\$38	\$408	28%
\$43	\$588	35%
\$47	\$767	42%

Sensitivity to Operating Cost Per Tonne Milled

C\$/t milled	NPV @ 10% Million	IRR
\$77	\$551	34%
\$87	\$479	31%
\$96	\$408	28%
\$106	\$337	26%
\$116	\$265	22%

Sensitivity to Capital Cost

C\$ Millions	NPV @ 10% Million	IRR
\$395	\$491	36%
\$445	\$450	32%
\$494	\$408	28%
\$544	\$367	25%
\$593	\$325	23%

FIGURE 22-1 NPV SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS





FIGURE 22-2 IRR SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS



CURRENT PRICE SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

RPA further conducted a rare earth oxide price sensitivity using a current price forecast (Q2 2012), which equates to a \$99/kg net revenue basket price. The current prices used to analyze the model are presented in Table 22-3.

TABLE 22-3 CURRENT SPOT PRICES
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Rare Earth Oxide	FOB China Q2 2012 Spot* (US\$/kg)
Ce ₂ O ₃	25
La ₂ O ₃	24
Nd ₂ O ₃	175
Pr ₂ O ₃	140
Sm ₂ O ₃	90
Eu ₂ O ₃	2,300
Gd ₂ O ₃	100
Sc ₂ O ₃	7,200
Y ₂ O ₃	132
Yb ₂ O ₃	90
Dy ₂ O ₃	1,100
Er ₂ O ₃	195
Ho ₂ O ₃	-
Lu ₂ O ₃	-
Tb ₄ O ₇	2,000
Tm ₂ O ₃	-

* Source: Metal-Pages.com

At current prices, the undiscounted pre-tax cash flow in this case totals \$5.9 billion. The IRR is 100% and the NPV is as follows:

- \$4.0 billion at a 5% discount rate
- \$3.3 billion at a 8% discount rate
- \$2.8 billion at a 10% discount rate

23 ADJACENT PROPERTIES

There are currently no adjacent properties looking for rare earth elements.

24 OTHER RELEVANT DATA AND INFORMATION

No additional information or explanation is necessary to make this Technical Report understandable and not misleading.

25 INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS

GEOLOGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES

The Mineral Resource estimate uses a cut-off grade of 130 ppm dysprosium. This reporting cut-off grade, which corresponds to 150 ppm for the oxide form, Dy₂O₃, produces an NSR value considerably higher than the anticipated cost of mining and processing. RPA considers that material with more than 130 ppm Dy meets the requirement of the Canadian Institute of Mining, Metallurgy and Petroleum (CIM) Definition Standards that Mineral Resources have a reasonable prospect of economic extraction.

Indicated Mineral Resources are estimated to total 9.23 Mt at 0.88% TREE (or 1.07% TREO), and Inferred Mineral Resources are estimated to total 5.17 Mt at 0.77% TREE (or 0.93% TREO).

TABLE 25-1 SUMMARY OF MINERAL RESOURCES – SEP. 30, 2012
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Classification	Zone	Tonnage (000 t)	Dy (ppm)	Nd (ppm)	Y (ppm)	HREE+Y (%)	TREE+Y (%)
Indicated	Central	9,229	189	1,442	1,040	0.17	0.88
Indicated	Extensions	--	--	--	--	--	--
Indicated Total		9,229	189	1,442	1,040	0.17	0.88
Inferred	Central	3,291	178	1,339	982	0.16	0.83
Inferred	Extensions	1,874	171	1,046	960	0.16	0.67
Inferred Total		5,165	176	1,233	974	0.16	0.77

Classification	Zone	Tonnage (000 t)	Dy ₂ O ₃ (ppm)	Nd ₂ O ₃ (ppm)	Y ₂ O ₃ (ppm)	HREO+Y (%)	TREO+Y (%)
Indicated	Central	9,229	218	1,687	1,345	0.21	1.07
Indicated	Extensions	--	--	--	--	--	--
Indicated Total		9,229	217	1,687	1,320	0.21	1.06
Inferred	Central	3,291	205	1,567	1,247	0.20	1.00
Inferred	Extensions	1,874	197	1,224	1,219	0.19	0.81
Inferred Total		5,165	202	1,442	1,237	0.20	0.93

Notes:

1. CIM definitions were followed for Mineral Resources.
2. Mineral Resources are estimated at a cut-off grade of 130 ppm Dy.
3. Numbers may not add due to rounding.

4. Heavy Rare Earth Elements (HREE) = Eu+Gd+Tb+Dy+Ho+Er+Tm+Yb+Lu+Y
5. Light Rare Earth Elements (LREE) = La+Ce+Pr+Nd+Sm
6. Total Rare Earth Elements (TREE) = sum of HREE and LREE
7. HREO, LREO refer to oxides of heavy and light rare earth elements respectively, and TREO is the sum of HREO and LREO.
8. Resources have been estimated inside a preliminary pit shell.

With the Central Area of the deposit still open at depth, future resource estimates will likely report higher tonnages, both of Indicated and Inferred Resources. The grade of the deeper resource currently appears to be similar to the shallower resource, so future resource estimates are likely to have similar grades to the current resource estimate, but with higher tonnages.

There is potential for the delineation of additional resources along strike, both east and west of the Central Area. The Phase III drilling targeted the Central Area at depth; future drilling should include deeper holes on the sections immediately adjacent to the Central Area. The recent drilling indicates that the most promising sections appear to be those immediately to the east of the Central Area.

Within the FT and Road Belt bands of the Central Area which host the rare-earth mineralization, the mineralization with economic potential is hosted in bands of felsic volcanics that are inter-layered with mafic bands. The first three phases of drilling have confirmed that it is possible to visually identify the felsic mineralization from the mafics; statistical analysis of the multi-element ICP data for the resource estimation studies also suggests that it is possible to identify the felsic material using automated classification based on major-element chemistry. The combination of a characteristic visual appearance and a characteristic multi-element signature creates many possibilities for efficient and effective grade control. There are optical and chemical sorting technologies that should be very effective at segregating the higher-grade material from the mixed volcanics.

Statistical analysis of the assay data from the felsic samples shows that there is a bi-modal distribution in the felsic bands. With the higher-grade population having grades about five times those of the lower-grade population, it may be possible to further upgrade the run-of-mine material into an even higher-grade product in fewer ore tonnes. To realize this possibility, a better understanding of the geology and mineralogy of the two felsic populations is needed.

The very strong correlations between the rare earth elements will simplify grade control. The entire rare earth suite of elements occurs as single package at Foxtrot, and a potential future mining operation will not have to contend with the complications of having to mine material that has low grades of some REEs in order to recover higher grades of other REEs.

With much of the high-grade mineralization lying in the southern third of the FT band, there is a possibility that the vast majority of the metal content may lie along a roughly tabular structure that is amenable to underground mining. An underground operation should be further studied, including the possibility of an underground operation that begins from the floor of a small starter pit.

PEA CONCLUSIONS

RPA disclosed the results of a Preliminary Economic Assessment (PEA) in a Technical Report dated July 15, 2012 (Cox et al., 2012) prepared for Search Minerals. The PEA was based on Mineral Resources estimated using the first two phases of drilling, and evaluated an open pit mining approach combined with processing by gravity, magnetic separation, and flotation concentration, followed by acid baking and water leaching, producing a mixed rare earth carbonate concentrate. PEA results have not yet been updated using the Sep. 30, 2012 Mineral Resource estimate disclosed in this report.

In RPA's opinion, the following conclusions presented in the July 15, 2012 PEA report remain valid.

The PEA indicated that positive economic results can be obtained for the Foxtrot Project, in a scenario that includes open pit mining, and rare earth recovery by acid baking/water leaching.

The LOM plan for the Project indicated that 14.3 Mt, at an average grade of 0.58% TREE, could be mined over 10 years at a nominal production rate of 4,000 tpd. REE production was projected to total 66 million kg.

Specific conclusions are as follows.

MINING

The July 15, 2012 PEA investigated production rates in the 3,000 tpd to 4,000 tpd range, for both open pit and underground mining methods. Within 200 m of surface, strip ratios remain low enough for open pit methods to produce more favourable results. Underground mining remains worth consideration when Phase III drilling (to more than 400 m depth) is incorporated into the resource estimate.

The July 15, 2012 PEA production rate is 1,440,000 tpa or 4,000 tpd of REE bearing material. Mining of ore and waste (no pre-stripping of overburden is required, as the deposit is exposed on surface) would be carried out by the owner and by contractor to balance mining equipment requirements over the life of the operation.

The combination of owner-operated and contract mining will be carried out using a conventional open pit method consisting of the following activities:

- Drilling performed by conventional production drills.
- Blasting using ANFO (ammonium-nitrate fuel oil) and a down-hole delay initiation system.
- Loading and hauling operations performed with hydraulic shovel, front-end loader and rigid frame haulage trucks.

Geotechnical and pit design parameters are assumptions based on comparable operations, and require site-specific investigation as the Project advances.

PROCESSING AND METALLURGY

Metallurgical testwork involved three beneficiation techniques to concentrate the REE in the Foxtrot sample, including Wilfley tabling, magnetic separation and flotation. The Wilfley tabling was used to test amenability to gravity concentration. Magnetic separation was used to reject magnetite from the Wilfley concentrates. Flotation was tested both as a primary method of concentration for the Foxtrot sample and as a scavenging method to recover additional REE from the Wilfley tails. The work was preliminary in nature.

Recovery of REEs from the combined beneficiation results ranges from 80% to 86%.

The gravity concentrate and the combined gravity/flotation concentrate were subjected to hydrometallurgical processing by acid leaching or acid baking at 200 °C to 250 °C followed by water leaching. The acid bake and water leach results produced high extractions.

Overall recoveries range from 79% to 82% for light rare earths, and 73% to 78% for heavy rare earths.

The process proposed for the PEA utilizes the following basic unit operations: crushing, grinding, gravity recovery, magnetic separation, flotation, acid bake, water leaching, and solution purification to recover a mixed REE product.

ENVIRONMENT

The Project is at an early stage, and Search Minerals has not yet begun environmental baseline work or community consultation. Despite that, RPA does not anticipate any fatal flaws regarding environmental issues with the Project as proposed. The challenges normal to permitting and developing an open pit mine in Labrador are expected to be manageable.

MARKETS

The market for rare earth products is small and public information on price forecasts and sales terms are difficult to obtain. Current prices are tracked by sources such as Asian Metal and Metal-PagesTM, based on transactions.

Recent history shows international rare earth market prices growing at an unprecedented rate since China cut export quotas by approximately 40% in 2011, then falling throughout 2012. China's overwhelming control on the rare earth supply chain, from upstream mining to downstream processing and end-user products, is likely to remain intact on all but a few materials through 2016. Rare earth prices are expected to remain volatile in the short term.

Price forecasting in this environment is difficult, and certain to contain wide margins of error.

A small number of REE producers outside of China are likely to be in operation by the time the Foxtrot Project is developed. This is expected to saturate the market for some LREO such as lanthanum and cerium, however, demand for high-value HREO (such as dysprosium) is expected to grow, and supply is expected to remain in deficit. Revenue for

the Foxtrot Project is dominated by dysprosium, neodymium, and terbium, elements that are projected to remain in supply deficit.

Rare earth prices were selected from the low end of a range of available forecasts, averaging \$38/kg of REO (net of separation charges). Q2 2012 spot prices, for comparison, average \$99/kg REO (net).

RPA considers these rare earths prices to be appropriate for a PEA-level study, however, we note that the recent market volatility introduces considerably more uncertainty than a comparable base or precious metals project. This uncertainty is mitigated to some extent, by the selection of conservative rare earths pricing.

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

The economic analysis is taken from the July 15, 2012 PEA (Cox et al., 2012) and is based on the Mineral Resource estimate at that time. The economic analysis has not been updated to reflect the updated Mineral Resources contained in this report.

The July 15, 2012 PEA is considered by RPA to meet the requirements of a PEA as defined in Canadian NI 43-101 regulations. The economic analysis contained in this section is based, in part, on Inferred Resources, and is preliminary in nature. Inferred Resources are considered too geologically speculative to have mining and economic considerations applied to them and to be categorized as Mineral Reserves. There is no certainty that the reserves development, production, and economic forecasts on which the July 15, 2012 PEA was based will be realized.

RPA conducted an economic analysis of the Foxtrot Project applying operating and capital costs estimates based on a 10 year production schedule.

The total life-of-mine capital is approximately \$494 million, including approximately \$103 million in contingency capital. The average operating cost over the life of the project is approximately \$96 per tonne milled.

The Foxtrot Project will process an average of 1,440,000 tpa at an average grade of 0.58% Total Rare Earth Elements (TREE), and produce an average of 6.5 million kilograms of payable rare earth material per year.

The economic analysis shows that, at an average Total Rare Earth Oxide (TREO) basket price of \$38 per kilogram, the project yields a pre-tax net NPV at a 10% discount rate of \$408 million. Total pre-tax undiscounted cash flow is \$1.1 billion. Over the life of mine, the pre-tax Internal Rate of Return is 28.5% with a payback period of approximately 2.8 years.

The pre-tax NPV at varying discount rates is as follows:

- \$408 million at a 10% discount rate
- \$504 million at an 8% discount rate
- \$686 million at a 5% discount rate

26 RECOMMENDATIONS

RPA recommends that Search Minerals continue collecting data to support the feasibility and licensing process, and proceed with further engineering studies.

Specific recommendations by area are as follows:

GEOLOGY & MINERAL RESOURCES

- Further drilling should be done, both at depth in the Central Area, and at depth in the extensions immediately adjacent to the Central Area. The deposit remains open at depth along its entire strike, even after the Phase III drilling program, which extended the strong mineralization to a depth of at least 400 m in the Central Area. Future drilling should continue to test the deep extensions of the resource in the Central Area and should test the shallower lateral extensions of the resource.
- The geological logging of the Phase I through Phase III drill holes should again be reviewed for consistency. The designation of the FT2, FT3, FT4 bands is not consistent in the FT zone. In the Road Belt zone the designation of the Road Belt counterparts to the FT bands should be reviewed for consistency.
- During drilling, the QA/QC data from Search Mineral's external monitoring program, as well as from Actlabs' internal monitoring program, should be reviewed monthly in order to identify batches of samples that may need to be re-analyzed, or to identify single samples for which a duplicate analysis would be useful. Although a good program has been in place for gathering QA/QC data during Phases I through III, the data from this program are usually assessed after the drilling has been completed. Regular monthly review of the QA/QC data, problems with accuracy and precision cannot be dealt with in a timely manner.
- Search Minerals should obtain certified reference materials with REE grades similar to those found at the Foxtrot project.

MINING

- Update PEA with results of current Mineral Resource estimate.
- Carry out geotechnical investigation for use in determining pit slopes and underground stope sizing.
- There are two factors that point to the viability of an underground mining operation: i) the concentration of the majority of the in situ metal along roughly tabular structures that are steeply dipping; ii) the continuity of strong mineralization to depths of more than 400 m. An underground operation should be further studied, including the possibility of an underground operation that begins from the floor of a small starter pit.

METALLURGICAL TESTWORK

- The mafic and felsic material and inter-mixed on a fine scale. With the felsic material carrying the lion's share of the mineralization, it would be useful to have some test work done on ore sorting possibilities, such as optical or x-ray sorting.
- If mafic material cannot be effectively segregated from felsic material, then some metallurgical test work is needed on the effect of mafic material in the run-of-mine ore feed. The felsic material has been the focus of test work; it would be useful to establish the effect on metallurgical recovery from the felsic material when it has been diluted by 10% to 20% mafic material.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

- Begin a program of environmental baseline study work.
- Engage in community and Aboriginal consultation regarding plans for the Project.

A budget for these recommendations has been estimated, as summarized in Table 26-1:

TABLE 26-1 BUDGET FOR PROJECT ADVANCEMENT
Search Minerals Inc. – Foxtrot Project

Item	Cost (C\$)
Infill drilling (40,000 m @ \$150/m)	6,000,000
Mineral Resource Update	100,000
Engineering Study	100,000
Metallurgical Testwork	100,000
Geotechnical Investigation	300,000
Environmental Baseline Studies	500,000
Total	7,100,000

27 REFERENCES

- Canadian Institute of Mining, Metallurgy and Petroleum (CIM), 2010: CIM Definition Standards for Mineral Resources and Mineral Reserves, Prepared by CIM Standing Committee on Reserve Definitions, Adopted by CIM Council, November 27, 2010
- Cox, J., Srivastava, R. M., Gauthier, J., Krutzelmann, H., 2012: Technical Report on the Foxtrot Project in Labrador, Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada, prepared by Roscoe Postle Associates Inc., prepared for Search Minerals Inc. (June 15, 2012).
- Dresinger, D. B., Clucas, J.D, Verbaan N., Grammatikopoulos T., Aghamirian, M., Forstner, C. 2012 The Processing of REE's from Search Minerals Foxtrot Resource, COM 2012.
- Gower, C.F., Neuland, S., Newman, M., and Smyth, J. 1987: Geology of the Port Hope-Simpson map region, Grenville Province, eastern Labrador. *In* Current Research. Newfoundland Department of Mines, Mineral Development Division, Report 87-1, pages 183-199.
- Gower, C.F., van Nostrand, T., and Smyth, J. 1988: Geology of the St. Lewis River map region, Grenville Province, eastern Labrador. *In* Current Research. Newfoundland Department of Mines, Mineral Development Division, Report 88-1, pages 59-73.
- Gower, C.F. 2007: Protolith recognition of metamorphosed volcanic/volcaniclastic rocks, with special reference to the Grenville Province in southeast Labrador. *In* Current Research. Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Natural Resources, Geological Survey, Report 07-1, pages 11-23.
- Gower, C.F., 2010: Geology of the St. Lewis River area (NTS sheets 03D/04 and 05; 13A/01, 02, 07 and 08), southeastern Labrador. Geological Survey, Mines Branch, Department of Natural Resources, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, Map 2010-24, Open File LAB/1566.
- Hanmer, S., Scott, D.J. 1990: Structural observations in the Gilbert River Belt, Grenville Province, southeastern Labrador. *In* Current Research, Part C. Geologic Survey of Canada, Paper 90-1C, pages 1-11.
- Mineral Commodities of Newfoundland & Labrador – Rare-Earth Elements (Including Y, Zr, Nb, Be), Geological Survey Mineral Commodities Series No. 6, Geological Survey of Newfoundland & Labrador, Compiled by A. Kerr and H. Rafuse, 2011.
- Search Minerals Press Release May 9, 2012 “Search Minerals Announces Successful Metallurgical Testing of Foxtrot Project Sample to Recover a 55.48% TREO +Y₂O₃ Product (46.99% TREE+Y) with Overall Average Recovery of 78.8%.

28 DATE AND SIGNATURE PAGE

This report titled Technical Report on the Foxtrot Project in Labrador, Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada, and dated December 14, 2012 was prepared and signed by the following author:

(Signed & Sealed) “*R. Mohan Srivastava*”

Dated at Toronto, ON
December 14, 2012

R. Mohan Srivastava, P.Geo.
Associate Principal Geologist

(Signed & Sealed) “*Jacques Gauthier*”

Dated at Quebec, QC
December 14, 2012

Jacques Gauthier, ing., MGP
Principal Mining Engineer

(Signed & Sealed) “*Jason J. Cox*”

Dated at Toronto, ON
December 14, 2012

Jason J. Cox, P.Eng.
Principal Mining Engineer

(Signed & Sealed) “*Holger Krutzelmann*”

Dated at Toronto, ON
December 14, 2012

Holger Krutzelmann, P.Eng.
Principal Metallurgical Engineer

29 CERTIFICATE OF QUALIFIED PERSON

JASON J. COX

I, Jason J. Cox, P.Eng., as an author of this report entitled "Technical Report on the Foxtrot Project in Labrador, Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada" prepared for Search Minerals Inc. and dated December 14, 2012 do hereby certify that:

1. I am a Senior Mining Engineer with Roscoe Postle Associates Inc. of Suite 501, 55 University Ave Toronto, ON, M5J 2H7.
2. I am a graduate of the Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada, in 1996 with a Bachelor of Science degree in Mining Engineering.
3. I am registered as a Professional Engineer in the Province of Ontario (Reg.# 90487158). I have worked as a Mining Engineer for a total of 15 years since my graduation. My relevant experience for the purpose of the Technical Report is:
 - Review and report as a consultant on more than a dozen mining operations and projects around the world for due diligence and regulatory requirements
 - Feasibility Study project work on three North American mines
 - Planning Engineer to Senior Mine Engineer at three North American mines
 - Contract Co-ordinator for underground construction at an American mine
4. I have read the definition of "qualified person" set out in National Instrument 43-101 (NI 43-101) and certify that by reason of my education, affiliation with a professional association (as defined in NI 43-101) and past relevant work experience, I fulfill the requirements to be a "qualified person" for the purposes of NI 43-101.
5. I did not visit the Foxtrot Project.
6. I am responsible for the overall preparation of the Technical Report and for Sections 1 through 6, 15, 19, 20, and 22 through 29 of the Technical Report.
7. I am independent of the Issuer applying the test set out in Section 1.5 of NI 43-101.
8. I have had no prior involvement with the property that is the subject of the Technical Report.
9. I have read NI 43-101, and the Technical Report has been prepared in compliance with NI 43-101 and Form 43-101F1.

10. At the effective date of the Technical Report, to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, the Technical Report contains all scientific and technical information that is required to be disclosed to make the Technical Report not misleading.

Dated this 14th day of December, 2012

(Signed & Sealed) “Jason J. Cox”

Jason J. Cox, P.Eng.

R. MOHAN SRIVASTAVA

I, R. Mohan Srivastava, P.Geo., as an author of this report entitled "Technical Report on the Foxtrot Project in Labrador, Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada" prepared for Search Minerals Inc. and dated December 14, 2012 do hereby certify that:

1. I am a consulting associate geologist with Roscoe Postle Associates Inc. of Suite 501, 55 University Ave Toronto, ON, M5J 2H7, and President of Benchmark Six Inc.
2. I am a graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Cambridge, MA, USA) in 1979 with a B.Sc. in Earth Sciences and of Stanford University (Stanford, CA, USA) in 1987 with a M.Sc. in Applied Earth Sciences (Geostatistics).
3. I am registered as a Professional Geologist in the Province of Ontario (Reg.#0547). I have worked as a resource estimation geologist and geostatistician for a total of 30 years since my graduation. My relevant experience for the purpose of the Technical Report is:
 - Resource estimation for base and precious metals projects
 - Resource estimation for poly-metallic deposits
 - Exploration and development drilling programs for volcanic-hosted mineral deposits
4. I have read the definition of "qualified person" set out in National Instrument 43-101 (NI 43-101) and certify that by reason of my education, affiliation with a professional association (as defined in NI 43-101) and past relevant work experience, I fulfill the requirements to be a "qualified person" for the purposes of NI 43-101.
5. I have not visited the Foxtrot Project site.
6. I am responsible for Sections 7 through 12, and 14 and parts of Sections 1, 25, and 26 of the Technical Report.
7. I am independent of the Issuer applying the test set out in Section 1.5 of NI 43-101.
8. I have had no prior involvement with the property that is the subject of the Technical Report.
9. I have read NI 43-101, and the Technical Report has been prepared in compliance with NI 43-101 and Form 43-101F1.
10. At the effective date of the Technical Report, to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, the Technical Report contains all scientific and technical information that is required to be disclosed to make the technical report not misleading.

Dated 14th day of December, 2012

(Signed & Sealed) "R. Mohan Srivastava"

R. Mohan Srivastava, P.Geo.

JACQUES GAUTHIER

I, Jacques Gauthier, ing., MGP, as an author of this report entitled "Technical Report on the Foxtrot Project in Labrador, Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada" prepared for Search Minerals Inc. and dated December 14, 2012 do hereby certify that:

1. I am Principal Mining Engineer with Roscoe Postle Associates Inc. of Suite 302, 1305 Boulevard Lebourgneuf, Québec, QC G2K 2E4.
2. I am a graduate of Université Laval, Québec, Quebec, in 1980 with a B.Sc. degree in Mining Engineering and Université du Québec en Abitibi-Témiscamingue, Québec, in 2002 with a Masters of Project Management – Professional Profile degree.
3. I am registered as a professional engineer in the Province of Ontario (Reg.#100110996) and an engineer in the Province of Quebec (Reg.#34899). I have worked as a mining engineer for a total of 31 years since my graduation. My relevant experience for the purpose of the Technical Report is:
 - Review and report as a consultant on mining operations and projects for due diligence and regulatory requirements
 - Project management of technical and economic feasibility studies
 - Mine planning and technical assistance
 - Practical experience in mining industry as Chief Engineer and Project Manager
4. I have read the definition of "qualified person" set out in National Instrument 43-101 (NI 43-101) and certify that by reason of my education, affiliation with a professional association (as defined in NI 43-101) and past relevant work experience, I fulfill the requirements to be a "qualified person" for the purposes of NI 43-101.
5. I visited the Foxtrot Project on October 27, 2011.
6. I am responsible for Sections 16, 18, and 21 and parts of Sections 1, 25, and 26 of the Technical Report.
7. I am independent of the Issuer applying the test set out in Section 1.5 of NI 43-101.
8. I have had no prior involvement with the property that is the subject of the Technical Report.
9. I have read NI 43-101, and the Technical Report has been prepared in compliance with NI 43-101 and Form 43-101F1.
10. At the effective date of the Technical Report, to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, the Technical Report contains all scientific and technical information that is required to be disclosed to make the Technical Report not misleading.

Dated 14th day of December, 2012

(Signed & Sealed) "Jacques Gauthier"

Jacques Gauthier, ing., MGP

HOLGER KRUTZELMANN

I, Holger Krutzelmann, P. Eng., as an author of this report entitled "Technical Report on the Foxtrot Project in Labrador, Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada" prepared for Search Minerals Inc. and dated December 14, 2012 do hereby certify that:

1. I am Vice President, Metallurgy & Environment with Roscoe Postle Associates Inc. of Suite 501, 55 University Ave Toronto, ON, M5J 2H7.
2. I am a graduate of Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada in 1978 with a B.Sc. degree in Mining Engineering (Mineral Processing).
3. I am registered as a Professional Engineer with Professional Engineers Ontario (Reg.# 90455304). I have worked in the mineral processing field, in operating, metallurgical, managerial; and engineering functions, for a total of 33 years since my graduation. My relevant experience for the purpose of the Technical Report is:
 - Reviews and reports as a metallurgical consultant on a number of mining operations and projects for due diligence and financial monitoring requirements
 - Senior Metallurgist/Project Manager on numerous gold and base metal studies for a leading Canadian engineering company.
 - Management and operational experience at several Canadian and U.S. milling operations treating various metals, including copper, zinc, gold and silver.
4. I have read the definition of "qualified person" set out in National Instrument 43-101 (NI 43-101) and certify that by reason of my education, affiliation with a professional association (as defined in NI 43-101) and past relevant work experience, I fulfill the requirements to be a "qualified person" for the purposes of NI 43-101.
5. I did not visit the Foxtrot Project.
6. I am responsible for Sections 13 and 17, and parts of Sections 1, 25, and 26 of the Technical Report.
7. I am independent of the Issuer applying the test set out in Section 1.5 of NI 43-101.
8. I have had no prior involvement with the property that is the subject of the Technical Report.
9. I have read NI 43-101, and the Technical Report has been prepared in compliance with NI 43-101 and Form 43-101F1.
10. At the effective date of the Technical Report, to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, the Technical Report contains all scientific and technical information that is required to be disclosed to make the Technical Report not misleading.

Dated this 14th day of December, 2012

(Signed & Sealed) "Holger Krutzelmann"

Holger Krutzelmann, P.Eng.