SEABRIDGE GOLD

April 22, 2019

Via Email

Southeast Alaska Conservation Council 2207 Jordan Avenue Juneau, Alaska 99801

Attention: Mr. Guy Archibald Staff Scientist

Dear Mr. Archibald:

RE: Correction of the Record, Facebook Post dated April 9th, 2019 on the Southeast Alaska Indigenous Transboundary Committee (SEITC) Facebook Page

I write to you with respect to the above subject, to correct the record regarding your misunderstanding of the interaction that occurred between the Alaskan Government and the BC Government during the recently completed review of KSM Mining ULC's request to extend our environmental certificate M14-01. You posted the following comment

Would have been nice if our Governor could have honoured the MOU and allowed our state agencies and the public have any notice about this?;

on the SEITC Facebook page on April 9, 2019 in response to a Mining.Com story titled, "Extension of environmental certificate approved for Canada's largest undeveloped gold project".

The requirements of the Transboundary MOU between the State of Alaska and the Province of British Columbia (BC) were honored and notification of the certificate extension review was provided to the State of Alaska by the Province of BC. The Province of BC, thru the offices of the BC Environmental Assessment Office (BC EAO) dutifully informed the State of Alaska representatives of receipt of the Application to Extend Certificate M14-01 and that the review process was underway, via email on October 9, 2018. This notification followed submission of a letter and the certificate extension application from KSM Mining ULC directly to State of Alaska representatives on October 3, 2018. Additionally, the BC EAO informed State representatives that the draft Review Process Summary Report was completed, via email on February 20, 2019, and then again informed the State via email on March 22, 2019, that the extension request had been approved.

I want to take this opportunity to again remind you of a quote from the Canadian Minister of the Environment in her decision statement approving the KSM Project: "*The project is not likely to cause adverse environmental effects as defined in the former Act* (referring to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act), *taking into account the implementation of mitigation measures described in the report*" and "*the mitigation measures and follow up programs described in the Report are appropriate for the project.*" Furthermore, the Minister in making her decision relied upon an independent Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency scientific report which stated, "*the agency has concluded that no significant adverse impacts on water quality, water quantity, fish, or human health are expected on the Alaskan side of the Unuk River.*"

I do understand that you, your coworkers, and other residents of Southeast Alaska remain opposed to the KSM Project. At the same time, in your opposition efforts, a responsibility lies with you and others to ensure that factual information regarding KSM and its regulatory processes is accurately communicated publicly to those interested in "transboundary issues".

I trust this letter has corrected your understanding of the regulatory review processes undertaken on KSM's Environmental Certificate Extension Application and how the notification requirements of the MOU between Alaska and BC were followed during the regulatory review. As always, I would be pleased to answer any outstanding questions that you may have regarding KSM.

Yours truly,

R Brent Murphy, M.Sc., P.Geol., Vice President, Environmental Affairs

 RBM/\dots