

Copper Mountain Mining Corporation

Mineral Reserve and Resource Estimate (as at Jan 1, 2021)

	Tonnes (‘000s)	Copper (%)	Gold (g/t)	Silver (g/t)	Copper (M lbs)	Gold (k oz)	Silver (k oz)
MINERAL RESERVES							
Proven and Probable							
Copper Mountain	403,433	0.24	0.11	0.76	2,154	1,413	9,827
Eva Copper	171,047	0.46	0.05	-	1,718	260	-
Sub-total Proven and Probable	574,480	0.31	0.09	0.76	3,872	1,673	9,827
Copper Mountain Stockpile	52,163	0.15	0.04	0.45	177	67	755
Total Proven and Probable	626,643	0.29	0.09	0.72	4,049	1,740	10,582

MINERAL RESOURCES (inclusive of mineral reserves)							
Measured and Indicated							
Copper Mountain	597,124	0.23	0.10	0.70	3,006	1,940	13,350
Eva Copper	260,659	0.42	0.04	-	2,419	330	-
Total Measured and Indicated	260,659	0.42	0.04	0.70	2,419	2,270	13,350

Inferred							
Copper Mountain	311,010	0.20	0.10	0.50	1,356	950	4,990
Eva Copper	46,267	0.42	0.04	-	431	51	-
Total Inferred	357,277	0.05	0.01	0.5	1,787	1,001	4,990

Please see accompanying Mineral Reserve and Mineral Resource notes on the next slide.

For full Mineral Reserve and Mineral Resource tables please see CMMC AIF filed on SEDAR

Copper Mountain Mining Corporation

Mineral Reserve and Mineral Resource Estimate Notes

Mineral Reserves

Copper Mountain Mine

1. JORC and CIM Definition Standards were followed for Mineral Reserves.
2. Mineral Reserves were generated using the January 1, 2021 mining surface.
3. Mineral Reserves are reported at a 0.10% Cu cut-off grade.
4. Mineral Reserves are reported using long-term copper, gold, and silver prices of \$2.75/lb, \$1,250/oz, and \$16.50/oz, respectively.
5. An average CMM copper process recovery of 80%, gold process recovery of 65%, and silver process recovery of 70% is based on geometallurgical domains and actual plant values.
6. An average Ingerbelle copper process recovery of 88.5%, gold process recovery of 71%, and silver process recovery of 65% is based on geo-metallurgical domains, historical recoveries, and recent test work.
7. Average bulk density is 2.78 t/m³.
8. Stockpile grades are approximations based on grade control results.
9. Stockpile tonnes and grade based on production grade process.

Eva Copper

1. CIM Definition Standards were followed for Mineral Reserves.
2. Mineral Reserves were generated using the January 31, 2019 mining surface.
3. Mineral Reserves are reported at an NSR cut-off value of \$8.95/t for Little Eva and Turkey Creek, \$9.35/t for Bedford and Blackard, \$10.32/t for Lady Clayre and Scanlan, and \$11.44/t for Ivy Ann.
4. Mineral Reserves are reported using long-term copper and gold prices of \$2.75/lb and \$1,250/oz, respectively.
5. Average process recoveries used in pit optimization ranged from 90% to 93% for copper sulphide, 63% for native copper, and 78% for gold were used for all deposit areas.
6. Little Eva, Turkey Creek, Bedford, and Lady Clayre have an equivalent 5.3% NSR royalty; Ivy Ann has an equivalent 5.8% royalty.
7. Blackard, Scanlan, and Turkey Creek do not contain gold.
8. Totals may show apparent differences due to rounding.

Mineral Resources

Copper Mountain Mine :

1. Mineral Resources were estimated using the January 1, 2021 mining surface for Copper Mountain Mine.
2. Mineral Resources are constrained by a \$3.50/lb Cu pit shell.
3. Cut-off grade is based on copper grade only.
4. Mineral Resources are inclusive of Mineral Reserves but do not include stockpiled material.
5. Mineral Resources are reported at a 0.10% cut-off.
6. Totals may not add due to rounding.

Eva Copper:

1. Joint Ore Reserves Code (JORC) and CIM definitions were followed for Mineral Resources.
2. Mineral Resources are inclusive of Mineral Reserves.
3. Mineral Resources are constrained within a Whittle pit shell generated with a copper price of \$3.50/lb, a gold price of \$1,250/oz and an exchange rate of AU\$1.35 = US\$1.00.
4. Density measurements were applied (ranges from 2.4 t/m³ to 3.0 t/m³).
5. Significant figures have been reduced to reflect uncertainty of estimations and therefore numbers may not add due to rounding.

Copper Mountain Mining Corporation

Mineral Reserve and Mineral Resource QPs

Copper Mountain Mine

The Mineral Resource estimate for the Copper Mountain mine was prepared by Mr. Peter Holbek, B.Sc (Hons), M.Sc. P. Geo, who is the Vice President, Exploration of Copper Mountain Mining Corporation. Mr. Holbek serves as the Qualified Person as defined by National Instrument 43-101. Mr. Holbek has reviewed and approved the Mineral Resource estimate for the Copper Mountain Mine.

Mr. Stuart Collins, P.E., serves as the Qualified Person as defined by National Instrument 43-101 and is the Qualified Person for information regarding the Copper Mountain mine's Mineral Reserve. Mr. Collins is independent of the Company and has reviewed and approved the Mineral Reserve estimate for the Copper Mountain Mine.

Eva Copper

The Mineral Resource estimate for the Eva Copper Project was prepared by Copper Mountain Mining Corporation in accordance with standards as defined by the Canadian Institute of Mining, Metallurgy and Petroleum ("CIM") "CIM Definition Standards-For Mineral Resources and Mineral Reserves", adopted by CIM Council on May 10, 2014.

Messrs. Paul Staples, Alistair Kent, David Johns, Peter Holbek, Stuart Collins, Mike Westendorf, Roland Bartsch and Richard Klue serve as Qualified Persons as defined by National Instrument 43-101 for the Technical Report related to the Eva Copper Project. Mr. Stuart Collins of SEC Enterprises Corp., who is independent of the Company, is the Qualified Person for Mining and the Mineral Reserve. Mr. Peter Holbek, Vice President, Exploration at Copper Mountain Mining Corporation, is the Qualified Person for the related Mineral Resource. Mr. Alistair Kent, Senior Project Manager for Merit Consultants International, who is independent of the Company, is the Qualified Person for the Development Capital Estimate. Mr. Paul Staples, Vice President and Global Practice Lead for Ausenco Limited, who is independent of the Company, is the Qualified Person for Ore Processing.