



May 29, 2026

Kelli Bergh
Vice President Environment and Permitting
BMC Minerals Ltd.

By Email: kelli.bergh@bmcm minerals.com

Re: Information Request 7 – Kudz Ze Kayah Mine Project, Socio-Economic Management Plan, Completeness Review Phase 2

Dear Kelli Bergh,

On September 20, 2024, BMC submitted Version 00 of the Socio-Economic Management Plan (SEMP), for the Kudz Ze Kayah Mine Project (the Project). BMC indicated that the SEMP adheres to the annotated outline provided by way of letter on February 27, 2023, from Mineral Resources Branch (MRB) to BMC. MRB conducted an initial review of the SEMP and held a joint meeting with BMC and their consultants SHE Consulting, and the Department of Health and Social Resources on December 4, 2024, to discuss revisions that would be sent out in an official IR.

As you are aware, on December 6, 2024, a ruling by the Yukon Court of Appeal was released with respect to the judicial appeal application made by Ross River Dena Council on behalf of the Kaska Nation. This ruling has set aside the March 8, 2024, Decision Document ("DD") and ordered the parties to return to consultation regarding the economic feasibility of the Project. MRB sent BMC a letter on December 16, 2024, notifying BMC that until a new DD is issued for the Project, MRB has no authority to take further action with respect to regulatory applications submitted to date and cannot evaluate whether the applications conform to and fulfill the terms of an operative DD.

On April 10, 2026, a new DD (YESAB File No. 2017-0083; Decision Document ID 2017-0083-8483) was issued and MRB expects SEMP to be updated to the new terms and conditions. The completeness review ensures that the application has been prepared in accordance with the annotated guideline, relevant Yukon legislation, policies and guidelines and has integrated

May 29, 2026

Page 2 of 2

Decision Document terms and conditions and Proponent Commitments relevant to the quartz mining license.

Yukon Government has reviewed the SEMP materials and determined that additional information is required to support a detailed review of the application. The information required is attached to this letter.

The information requests are pertinent to our ability to complete the review of the application. If the information requested is not available or deemed unnecessary by BMC, a response with expected timelines or rationale for its exclusion is required.

Once you have taken the time to consider the contents of this letter and its attachments, please confirm your estimated timeline for response. Should you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact myself or Arom Jacob at arom.jacob@yukon.ca.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Nordling', with a stylized, cursive script.

Monica Nordling
A/Manager, Major Mines Licensing

CC:

Scott Whitehead, Assistant Deputy Minister, Mineral Resources and Geoscience Services

Karen Clyde, Director, Yukon Waterboard Secretariat

Allan Nixon, VP External Affairs, BMC Minerals Ltd.

Keith Maguire, Director, Major Projects Yukon

Chief Stephen Charlie, Liard First Nation

Chief Dylan Loblaw, Ross River Dena Council

Chief Angela Hocken, Kwadacha Nation

Chief Myles Manygreyhorses, Dease River First Nation

Enclosed: Information Request 7: Phase 2 Completeness Review, Socio-Economic Management Plan

Information Request 7

This information request is issued to BMC Minerals Ltd with respect to their Socio-Economic Management Plan Revision 00 (the “SEMP” or “Plan”) for the Kudz Ze Kayah mine project. This information request pertains to the Completeness Review of the SEMP.

Several updates to the SEMP are required and have been identified in this information request. An updated plan must include a concordance table that demonstrates how Decision Document terms and conditions and proponent commitments have been met and must indicate how and where information requirements have been addressed.

1. Editorial

Editorial items have been identified that would improve the clarity and consistency of the plan.

1.1. Organization

Organization of the plan is confusing and requires reorganizing so that it is easier to follow. From our review and feedback in initial comments, we are concerned that confusion and misunderstandings will not allow for meaningful consultation and comment from YG departments and FN. This document would benefit from a summary of implementation: monitoring, reporting, review at the outset of the SEMP, and where each committee comes into play.

IR1-1: The SEMP should follow the prescribed guidance format and numbered headings as closely as possible; any deviation must be clearly identified and justified with a documented rationale

IR1-2: Provide a summary of the SEMP, describing how the SEMP will be implemented and how each committee will be involved. Consider including a graphic element (e.g., a systems map) to provide an overview of the Plan at a glance.

IR1-3: Provide context and background information regarding the form and function of the committees introduced in Section 3.1 (i.e., Management Advisory Committee, Heritage Management Committee, and Environmental Committee). Include information on the purpose of each of these committees, as well as providing the specifics of how they were formed and how they will operate moving forward.

IR1-4: The description of the SEMP working group is provided too late in the plan. Provide a high-level introduction to the SEMP working group earlier in the plan

or move the entire section (7.2.4) describing the SEMP working group to an earlier point in the document.

1.2. Missing Definitions

IR1-5: Provide definitions or explanations in the Glossary for the following terms used throughout the plan:

- a. Valued Components
- b. Gross Domestic Product
- c. Qualified professional and qualified expert
 - i. Explain the difference between these two terms.
 - ii. Explain how these individuals are qualified, specifically regarding teaching cultural and First Nation awareness (Section 5.1.4), and gender appropriate and sexuality specific policies (Section 5.2.5.3).
- d. Microwave communications
- e. Other key terminology

1.3. Missing Text

IR1-6: Text in Section 1 figures is not visible, and figures are not labelled to correspond with Table of Contents and in-text citations. Provide updated figures with correct text boxes.

1.4. Language Sensitivities

Several instances of sensitive language uses were identified in the Plan that should be changed to more appropriate language to increase representation and acceptance of affected parties.

IR1-7: All references of alcohol- or substance-“abuse” should be changed to alcohol- and substance-“use”.

IR1-8: Language when referring to First Nation People should remain consistent throughout the plan; remove mentions of “Aboriginal” or “Indigenous,” except when citing an Act.

1.5. Appropriate and Consistent Terminology

IR1-9: In Figure 1-5, Whitehorse, Faro, Ross River, and Watson Lake are labelled as Local and Regional Study Areas, whereas they are referred to as Local and Regional Monitoring Areas in the main text of the plan. Please ensure that the term used are consistent between figures and the main text.

IR1-10: It is not made clear whether there is a difference between BMC's Corporate Framework and the Business Integrity Framework (Section 1.4.1). If these Frameworks differ, outline the differences. If they are the same, ensure the terminology is consistent throughout the plan.

IR1-11: In Section 3.2, the plan states that "Most organizations that participated in the engagement were excited about BMC coming into their area..." Management plans should endeavour to maintain a level of objectivity to them that this statement does not meet.

IR1-12: Consider rewording the sentence: "Ross River, Faro and Watson Lake all have relatively high proportions of their populations working in trades, transport, equipment operators and related occupations who are most likely to find employment on the Project during the Construction phase." The current iteration of the sentence is confusing; a better way to word the sentence is: "The construction phase of the project will have more availability for roles in trades, transport, equipment operation, and related occupations as compared to operations and closure phases."

IR1-13: Remove the term "impossible" from the sentence "it is impossible to sign long term commercial agreements" (Section 5.1.6.2) and replace with a term that more accurately describes the situation and does not use absolutes.

IR1-14: The plan states that "BMC will have education and resources in place to support and/or eliminate sexual violence and suicide" (Section 5.2.2). The scope of this commitment is not made clear. There needs to be acknowledgment that education and resources alone will not eliminate these issues. BMC should recognize that policies are only one part of creating safer workspaces. Hiring community mentors is another. Neither may eliminate issues of discrimination or racism if a culture of safety is not created or maintained.

Consider rewording to "BMC will have education and resources in place to address and help prevent sexual violence and suicide."

1.6. Referencing

IR1-15: The sentence "Whitehorse has nearly all, or more than, the government services and recreational infrastructure available in much larger centres in other parts of Canada" is missing a citation and is unclear in its message. Either remove this sentence or provide a citation and further clarification. (Section 1.3.4)

IR1-16: Provide a citation for the following sentence: "make direct and indirect use of waters downstream from the proposed mine, both through drinking and

through reliance on the fish and animal species who rely on those waters – which intersect important caribou and other ungulate and wildlife species movement corridors” (Section 1.3.5). When citing Kaska individuals, please provide references and citations for where this information was gathered and who is being cited.

IR1-17: Provide a citation for the following sentence: “are still living with the negative impacts of five failed mines in Kaska territory – Faro, Cantung, Ketza, Sa Dena Hes, and Wolverine” (Section 1.3.5).

IR1-18: Provide a citation for the following sentence: “Whitehorse has the capacity to readily absorb an increase in population caused by Project employees relocating from outside of Yukon” (Section 5.3.1).

IR1-19: Clarify and provide citations for the SEMP’s stance on how the potential population increase will impact the housing market and community services in Faro.

IR1-20: Include acknowledgement of the Faro Mine Remediation Project that will be occurring at the same time and may have an impact on available community resources in Faro and Ross River.

IR1-21: Provide acknowledgement and include reference to Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women, Girls, and Two-Spirit+ (MMIW2GS+) people and Yukon’s MMIWG2S+ strategy as noted in the Final Screening Report.

IR1-22: Provide a citation for the following sentence: Faro is therefore more likely than any other community to see a population increase because of the Project and, if that increase is significant, may experience more socio-economic effects” (Section 1.3.6). Include the methodology for how a significant increase in population will be measured. Consider a reference to the YESAB Evaluation Report.

IR1-23: A reference for Ernst and Young (2017) (Section 5.1.1) is missing. Ensure that all references have been provided.

1.7. Further Context Needed

IR1-24: Provide background information on the Valued Components and how and where they were developed. Ensure that this introduction is placed in the plan prior to being mentioned in other sections.

IR1-25: Clarify how “there are no mine hazards that could plausibly impact land users” (Concordance Table 14.10). Note that the EC has identified impacts on communities and traditional land use in the Final Screening Report that should

be addressed in the SEMP. Hazards beyond physical hazards should be considered.

IR1-26: Provide the rationale behind how each plan listed in Table 1-3 relates to the Valued Components described in the SEMP.

IR1-27: In Section 2.2, the plan indicates that the Yukon Government is "obligated" to establish a monitoring program to measure project effects against pre-baseline data. Please correct the statement to note that the Yukon Government *or a delegate body* is to establish the monitoring program.

IR1-28: The SEMP references training, apprenticeships, and skill development in Section 5.1.4 (Employability – Education, Training and Experience) but does not provide sufficient detail on these programs or their role in supporting career transition. Additional information is required to provide a list and description of training and apprenticeship programs, including program structure, delivery methods, target participants (e.g., Kaska citizens and Yukon residents), and how these programs support career progression and workforce transition, including during mine closure.

2. Engagement

Table 3-1 lists organizations that BMC identified as having potential interest in engaging on the SEMP during a "scoping exercise".

IR1-29: Please provide more information on the process involved in the scoping exercise and as per Section 3 of the annotated outline, please summarize the reason for each party's expected involvement in engagement (e.g., proximity to site, land claims, land users, etc.).

Section 3.2 states that successful engagement(s) occurred with 20 of the Organizations that were contacted (Appendix C). Comments and recommendations from each Organization were documented, reviewed and where applicable incorporated into the SEMP (Chapters 4 through 7). However, there does not appear to be any further mention of comments and recommendations received, nor how they were incorporated into the SEMP.

IR1-30: As per the Annotated Outline please provide a summary of the input received from each organization (engagement summaries) and how it was incorporated into the plan.

Section 3 states that "BMC has had significant engagement with Kaska leadership, Kaska administrative bodies, and Kaska citizens..." The use of the term "significant" here is subjective

and contradicts Section 3.1 which describes a lack of direct engagement from the Ross River Dena Council and the Liard First Nation in the development of the SEMP.

IR1-31: Consider removing the use of “significant” in this instance.

IR1-32: In Appendix C, the plan states that there were zero successful engagements with Ross River Dena Council, however the comments describe a response from “Chief.” Edit the table to be consistent and include the name of the Chief. Ensure that all other engagements in this table are accurate and edit accordingly.

IR1-33: Provide additional information on the signed Traditional Knowledge Protocol and specifics of the monitoring program for identifying any new potential effects (Section 2.6.2). Please also clarify how these new potential effects will be defined (e.g., effects on the Project or effects of implementing the Traditional Knowledge).

2.1. Socio-Economic Participation Agreement

IR1-34: Outline all reporting requirements to the Kaska Nation as part of the Socio-economic Participation Agreement (SEPA), if any (Section 2.6). Provide specifics on how often and/or in what scenarios the SEPA would be updated.

IR1-35: Ensure that monetary specifics regarding agreements made with the Kaska Nation in the SEPA are able to be shared publicly. If not, remove these values from Section 5.1.6.

IR1-36: Provide clarification on how and when MRB will be notified about a modernized SEPA so the license and plan can be amended to reflect the new agreement, if necessary.

IR1-37: Describe how the management framework in the SEPA fits into this SEMP (meetings, reporting, etc)

3. Human Health and Wellbeing

IR1-38: Provide clarification on the Employee Assistance Program (EAP) (Section 5.1.1) and what BMC is committing to with this program. Specifically, include a paragraph clarifying the scope of who program benefits and how these benefits will be accessible. Include the Insurer’s Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) to address some of this information.

IR1-39: Consider creating and adding an EAP policy to Section 1.4.1 to increase clarity regarding this program.

IR1-40: Expand on how BMC plans to “encourage the participation of local communities, local Indigenous Peoples and associated businesses in its projects wherever practicable” in Section 5.1.3.4.

IR1-41: Please provide description of on-site medical services described in Section 5.2.1. How many First Aid trained employees there will be proportionally and on shift, how many nurses/onsite Health & Safety people, will they be trained in mental health?

IR1-42: Include gender-diverse individuals when identifying gender-specific areas of facility use (e.g., camp bathrooms).

IR1-43: Please clarify the temporal scope of the statements made in Section 5.2.5.3 (e.g., entire life of the mine, or just the pre-construction phase).

4. Environmental Health Services

IR1-44: The *Public Health and Safety Act* and associated regulations should be referenced in this plan. Please contact Environmental Health Services if there are any questions about onsite requirements.

IR1-45: Include a statement that BMC must submit bacteriological samples to Environmental Health Services on a schedule determined by a Health Officer. The schedule is determined based on water source risk and population served.

IR1-46: Include a statement that if the water is deemed not potable at any point BMC must work with Environmental Health Services to determine the cause and rectification of the issue of non-potable water.

IR1-47: Note that water well construction must be completed as per the Canadian Well Drillers Guidelines and meet the Canadian Drinking Water Guidelines. All water treatment objectives must have Environmental Health Services review and approval.

IR1-48: Please change the “Department of Social Services” in the table to “Department of Health and Social Services.”

5. Tourism and Culture

Communication with tourism stakeholders listed below should be expanded upon to ensure that current and future tourism activities are not impacted by project activities.

- a. Tourism Industry Association of the Yukon (TIAY)
- b. Yukon First Nations Culture and Tourism Association (YFNCT)
- c. Wilderness Tourism Association of the Yukon (WTAY)

The SEMP indicates that the Proponent intends to communicate regularly with the outfitter, but it is unclear if this is happening and whether the outfitter had any input on the SEMP. The SEMP engagement log indicates that a letter was sent to YBGO with a follow-up phone call, but it is unclear if any engagement occurred, as it says, “unable to contact three weeks after forwarding discussion document” (SEMP Appendix C, page C-III). Yukon Big Game Outfitters (YBGO) has the potential to be the most affected tourism business, as stated in YESAB’s Draft Screening Report (DSR page 165). Advanced knowledge of disruptive activities, especially helicopter activity, is useful information for the outfitter. Hunt locations can then be planned accordingly.

IR1-49: BMC to work with Yukon Big Game Outfitters to find a convenient time and method to regularly connect and discuss concerns.

The DSR indicated that limited tourism activities overlap with the project footprint. However, over the life of the project, tourism could increase in the area. For this reason, the three main Yukon tourism associations listed below could be included in the SEMP and contacted periodically, along with Frances Lake Lodge and Inconnu Lodge.

- Tourism Industry Association of the Yukon (TIAY)
- Yukon First Nations Culture and Tourism Association (YFNCT)
- Wilderness Tourism Association of the Yukon (WTAY).

Note that Frances Lake Lodge is temporarily closed and currently for sale.

Note that the SEMP states that “BMC will assist RRDC in the purchase of Inconnu Lodge (funding for this will come from modernized SEPA payments)” (Section 5.5.4).

IR1-50: BMC should consider including other tourism stakeholders in the SEMP.