## COMPARISON ON INAC, AEM AND GEOVECTOR SECURITY ESTIMATES

GEOVECTOR ESTIMATES INCLUDE TAILINGS AND ROCK PILE COVERAGES OF 2.5M (BASE CASE), 2.0M AND 3.0M THICKNESSES

|                                | INAC         | AEM          | KIA          |
|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                                | Estimate     | End of Mine  | End of Mine  |
|                                |              | Life         | Life         |
|                                |              |              |              |
| Open Pit                       | \$2,441,495  | \$1,771,391  | \$1,610,591  |
| Underground Mine               | \$0          | \$0          |              |
| Tailings                       | \$20,573,794 | \$5,490,990  | \$19,560,990 |
| Rock Pile                      | \$4,174,265  | \$3,521,990  | \$9,072,290  |
| Buildings and Equipment        | \$6,057,562  | \$2,384,085  | \$2,418,009  |
| Chemicals and Soil Management  | \$538,754    | \$461,765    | \$461,765    |
| Water Management               | \$0          | \$283,055    | \$283,055    |
| Post Closure Site Maintenance  | \$0          | \$743,874    | \$0          |
|                                |              |              |              |
| Sub Total                      | \$33,785,869 | \$14,657,150 | \$33,406,700 |
|                                |              |              |              |
| Mobilization/Demobilization    | \$802,207    | \$506,873    | \$863,180    |
| Monitoring and Maintenance     | \$840,000    | \$550,000    | \$840,000    |
|                                |              |              |              |
| Market Factor Price Adjustment | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          |
|                                |              |              |              |
| Project Management             | \$1,689,293  | \$439,715    | \$1,670,335  |
| Engineering                    | \$1,689,293  | \$439,715    | \$1,670,335  |
| Contingency                    | \$5,067,880  | \$1,465,715  | \$5,011,005  |
|                                |              |              |              |
| Grand Total                    | \$43,874,543 | \$18,059,168 | \$43,461,555 |

Open Pit - INAC included very large costs for breaching dykes, GV felt AEM's numbers more credible. INAC actually estimated pump cost (\$0.02/m3), whereas AEM used lump estimates, GV used INAC's rates. INAC included monitoring/maintainance costs which AEM broke out separately as a line item in the summary, GV went with AEM's methods Tailings - INAC estimate includes 8 Million cubic meters of cover for the tailings impoundment (5 m thick over 160 ha) vs 1.25 Million cubic meters for AEM estimate (2.5 m thick over 50 hectares). GV used INAC areas at 2.5, 2.0 and 3.0m thickness, but used AEM's unit rate for placement (\$4.20) vs INAC's (\$3.67)

Rock Piles - INAC estimate includes 3.4 Million cubic meters of total cover material for waste rock piles vs 0.45 Million cubic meters for AEM estimate - Portage 2.5 m thick for 10 Ha & Vault 2.5 m thick for 8 Ha. GV used INAC's areas but with 2.5, 2.0 and 3.0m thicknesses

Buildings and Equipments - INAC estimates for floor area appear reasonable (approximately 39,00 m2), AEM's seem very low (approximately 10,000m2) GV went with INAC's area, bu did not escalate for multiple floors, as most of the buildings are warehouse shell type (INAC's volume multiplier is approximately 126,000m3). AEM used \$35.2 per sq m. as the RECLAIM unit cost table steel building teardown cost INAC sometimes used \$52.8 per sq m which at high end. GV feels the simple structure of the buildings will be toward the low end

Chemicals and Soil Management - GV agreed with AEM's estimates

Water Management - GV agreed with AEM's estimates. INAC included similar costs under the Open Pits

Post Closure Site Manintenance - AEM includes a complex future value calculation here. The items seem to be covered under Monitoring and Maintenance, so GV deleted this cost

Mobilization/Demobilization - After review of both estimates (INAC and AEM), GV believes INAC's estimates are more credible. GV's estimate is slightly higher than INAC's because fo inclusion of some AEM costs tha twere mssed by INAC.

Monitoring Maintenance - After review of both estimates (INAC and AEM), GV believes INAC's estimates are more credible.

Project Management - INAC used 5% of the sub-totaled cost, AEM used 3%, GV went with INAC's 5%

Engineering - INAC used 5% of the sub-totaled cost, AEM used 3%. GV went with INAC's 5%

Contingency - INAC used 15% of the sub-totaled cost, AEM used 10%. GV went with INAC's 15%