

OPEN LETTER FROM PACIFIC BOOKER MINERALS INC. REGARDING THE MORRISON PROJECT

Pacific Booker Minerals Inc. is a Canadian natural resource exploration company which is in the advanced stage of exploration of the Morrison deposit, a porphyry copper/gold/molybdenum ore body, located 35 km north of Granisle, BC. The Morrison Lake area was first explored for minerals in the early 1960's. Regional stream sediment sampling in 1962 led to the discovery of the Morrison deposit in 1963. After 10 years of exploration, Noranda determined that the deposit would not be economical to mine at that time. PBM acquired the Morrison property and has worked in the local area since the mid 1990's.

In September 2003, PBM entered the Environmental Assessment process. The application submitted in 2010 was detailed, comprehensive and had been prepared by highly qualified individuals and based on many years of study. It had been reviewed by the EA Working Group. Changes and mitigation plans were made in reflection of the concerns raised. In September 2012, the Ministers refused the certificate. PBM challenged that decision in the BC Supreme Court. In December 2013, the ruling from the Supreme Court quashed the decision and ordered the project to be reconsidered by the government. In July 2015, the Ministers decided that further assessment, unspecified, was required. Between July 2015 and January 2021, PBM attempted to determine exactly what information was required, but was unsuccessful in obtaining specifics. Starting in February and continuing until December 2021, EAO compiled the parties' views on potential options on how to address the lack of progress being made on the further assessment order. In December 2021, the Ministers decided to rescind the Further Assessment Order and the EAO referred the 2015 decision materials to the Ministers. In February 2022, the decision by the Ministers was that an EAC would not be issued for the Morrison Project but that the Act allowed PBM to submit another proposal based on a new project design in the future. Since then, PBM has been advised that we can make no progress in the EA process unless we have the support of the Lake Babine Nation. PBM has been requesting an opportunity to meet face to face to discuss the matter with the LBN, but all of our requests have received negative or no responses.

In LBN letters received, the following statement has been made: "The mine would destroy an environmentally and culturally sensitive part of our Territory. It would sit right beside T'akh TI'ah Bin, which offers rearing habitat for our talok, and perpetual water treatment would be required after the mine closes. These are unacceptable risks for water and salmon, our most precious resources." During the environmental assessment, the water and salmon received considerable attention. The opinion of the scientific professionals that studied the project does not support the statement made by the LBN.

PBM was told by the LBN legal counsel that we were not allowed to communicate directly with the LBN and that all communications must be sent to the lawyer. This made an already difficult situation even more difficult and added delays that were not necessary. It also prevented PBM from hearing directly what the wants of the LBN were/are. Even as late as 2022, we were forced to deal through the lawyers. That does not make for a good working relationship. During the 2013 court case, the LBN legal counsel referred to the March 2012 Memorandum of Understanding as an alleged MOU. That MOU was prepared and signed by the LBN and agreed to support the Project if the environmental assessments of the Project concluded that with the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, the Project was not likely to result in environmental effects that will significantly and adversely impact the Lake Babine Nation way of life. The EAO's final Assessment Report concluded just that. Yet the Lake Babine Nation states that it is opposed to the Project.

PBM wishes to state that our shared concern for the environment around the proposed mine site and the associated facilities has led us to engage the services of highly respected and knowledgeable individuals to provide ongoing guidance to our endeavours in this regard. Dr. Andrew Weaver and others have agreed to provide advice and guidance services on a consulting basis. It is PBM's belief that meeting with these individuals will provide an opportunity to improve understanding on both sides and to provide some measure of reassurance about PBM's good intentions.

PBM has outlined some ideas for discussion in letters sent to the LBN and has stated that we are open to discussion of any additional items that are a concern for the LBN and its members. The ideas presented are briefly summarized below.

Salmon Protection and Enhancement--Suggested to be done on an ongoing basis and could result in an increased number of salmon in the Morrison system. **Removal of Beaver Dams and/or Beavers**--To avoid interference with salmon travelling to and spawning in Morrison Creek, or passing through Morrison Lake, routine patrols in the spring could identify beaver dam sites and the removal of any interfering dams could be an ongoing annual activity funded by PBM. If removal of beavers is considered necessary, PBM understands that there are local trappers that are familiar with that area. Given the price of beaver pelts in the last few years, PBM would be willing to subsidize these trappers on an ongoing basis to make the trapping financially worthwhile.

Spawning Channel Addition--Many years ago there was a highly effective man-made spawning channel in the Morrison Creek / Morrison Arm area. According to reports from that time, this channel was credited with significant enhancement of the Babine Lake salmon runs. Replacement of a similar channel and its ongoing operation could be readily achieved as part of the efforts to enhance the salmon runs in the area. As well, the rerouting of the seasonal small water courses possibly offers an additional opportunity for spawning enhancement. **Water Quality and Fish Population Surveys**--To add to the existing knowledge base, PBM is suggesting the establishment of a Steering Committee to provide independent guidance in regards to further baseline studies in the areas of water quality, water flows and fish populations. **Water Surveys**--PBM proposes at least one expert to study, on an ongoing basis, the water quality in the area. Using modern intelligent sampling devices, it is anticipated nearly continuous water quality monitoring will be possible. **Fish Surveys**--PBM proposes to resume fish counting and classifying on a regular basis. This would be undertaken with sufficient encouragement or if deemed crucial. **Green**

Modernization--There have been many changes in the mining industry since the original plan was made and some have provided significant opportunities to reduce the carbon footprint of the project and protect the environment further. **Electric vs Diesel Powered Mining Equipment**--In the original mine plan, the principal equipment was diesel powered. The best choices for long life, low sustaining capital costs, and reduced carbon footprint are electric shovels and drills. **Fuel Selection**--The passage of time has resulted in an unexpected benefit in that the LNG facilities being built passes very close to the Morrison property making the use of natural gas as a fuel very attractive. **Risk Reduction**--A review of the project design identified certain items that, although considered to have a very low probability of occurrence, could contribute to an unwelcome event. **Site Access Roads**--Once on site, the road would be located onto the side of the mine pit furthest away from the lake. **Additional Site Water Control**--The area between the pit and the lake shore would contain a dam to assist in preventing any fugitive water from anywhere on the site from entering Morrison Lake directly. The dam allows for all water leaving the site and re-entering the environment to be positively monitored and treated if required. **Financial Benefits**--Provincial laws have created a financial benefit to the LBN in the form of resource tax sharing that will happen if PBM develops the mine. **Local Hiring**--PBM would continue its practice of hiring local people for employment at the project and use of locally available support service businesses preferentially. **Scholarship Fund**--PBM would be willing to contribute on an annual basis (based on production) to fund scholarships for LBN students to attend post-secondary schools.

"We cannot trust a company that has litigated against us and that fought our application to participate in its judicial review about a project in the core of our Territory."

If the "litigated" reference has to do with the 2008 law suit, it was caused by Chief Patrick issuing a news release stating that "the LBN is withdrawing from dialogue"... "due to serious concerns regarding Pacific Booker's conduct". At virtually the same time of issuing the news release to the media outlets, the LBN sent a letter to PBM with the following message: "We look forward to confirming a meeting to first discuss an agreement that establishes a framework for us to engage with both you and the regulators in respect to the project" and "We look forward to developing a stronger and mutually supportive relationship". In November of 2008, PBM and LBN entered into a capacity funding agreement and PBM paid \$63,500 to the LBN for that. Following the signing of that agreement, Chief Patrick stated "This is a good first step in our relationship of mutual respect and we look forward to entering into many more agreements with PBM, including an Impact and Benefits Agreement." Following the signing of the agreement, PBM asked for a retraction of the negative comments made as a public retraction would have solved the issue. PBM gave LBN the opportunity to retract the statements prior to filing the court action in December 2008. In October 2009, PBM discontinued the court case as a new Chief had taken charge. The LBN was compensated in the amount of \$80,000 for legal costs.

If the "fought our application" reference has to do with our 2013 visit to the court in regards to the 2012 refusal to grant the EAC by the BC Government, PBM did not fight against the LBN participation as an intervenor. The court action was directed at the BC Government and the claim was based on breach of procedural fairness and breach of legitimate expectations, because of the way the decision was made. PBM's legal firm asked that the application for leave to intervene be denied because the LBN were not a "named party" in the court action and that their participation would increase the time required and therefore the costs to the parties in the claim. A lawyer making a legal point is not the same as fighting against something and the court granted the intervenor status.

#1203 - 1166 Alberni Street, Vancouver, BC V6E 3Z3 Phone: 604 681-8556 or 1-800-747-9911 email: info@pacificbooker.com