



# A TRACK RECORD OF CREATING VALUE

March 2019



# Marigold Mine





# Cautionary Notes



## Cautionary Note Regarding Forward-Looking Statements

This presentation contains forward-looking information within the meaning of Canadian securities laws and forward-looking statements within the meaning of the U.S. Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (collectively, "forward-looking statements"). All statements, other than statements of historical fact, are forward-looking statements. Generally, forward-looking statements can be identified by the use of words or phrases such as "expects," "anticipates," "plans," "projects," "estimates," "assumes," "intends," "strategy," "goals," "objectives," "potential," "believes," or variations thereof, or stating that certain actions, events or results "may," "could," "would," "might" or "will" be taken, occur or be achieved, or the negative of any of these terms or similar expressions. The forward-looking statements in this news release relate to, among other things: future production of gold, silver and other metals; timing of production; future costs of inventory, cash costs and all-in sustaining costs ("AISC") per payable ounce of gold, silver and other metals sold; expected exploration and development expenditures; the prices of gold, silver and other metals; our ability to discover new areas of mineralization, to convert Inferred Mineral Resources to Indicated Mineral Resources, to expand Mineral Reserves and to convert Mineral Resources into Mineral Reserves; the timing and extent of capital investment at our operations; the timing and extent of capitalized stripping at our operations; the Seabee Gold Operation continuing to deliver growth and Puna Operations ramping-up to steady-state operations in 2019; our cash position remaining strong for 2019 growth and beyond; ; opportunities to increase the economics of the Marigold mine, the Seabee Gold Operation and Puna Operations; our expected exploration and drill programs at each of the Marigold mine, the Seabee Gold Operation, Puna Operations and our other projects; timing for and potential of Marigold mine equipment replacement study and Red Dot conversion scenarios; the anticipated effect of haul truck and equipment purchases at the Marigold mine on future production; the expansion of the Seabee Gold Operation based on the results of the 2017 Technical Report, including the increase of mining and milling rates; the 2017 Technical Report representing production growth, improved margins and expansion of Mineral Resources; timing, amount and duration of future production of gold under the 2017 Technical Report; the estimated capital and operating costs under the 2017 Technical Report; the estimates of net cash flow, net present value and economic returns from the Seabee Gold Operation under the 2017 Technical Report; the expansion of tailings at the Seabee Gold Operation, the timing and capacity thereof, and such capacity being in excess of that contemplated under the 2017 Technical Report; the completion of certain Chinchillas project infrastructure, the timing thereof and such remaining on budget; the expected timing of investment catalysts with respect to our investment in SilverCrest Metals Inc.; anticipated community, development and holding costs; estimated production rates for gold, silver and other metals produced by us; the estimated cost of sustaining capital; ongoing or future development plans and capital replacement, estimates of expected or anticipated economic returns from our mining projects, including future sales of metals, concentrate or other products produced by us and the timing thereof; and our plans and expectations for our properties and operations.

These forward-looking statements are subject to a variety of known and unknown risks, uncertainties and other factors that could cause actual events or results to differ from those expressed or implied, including, without limitation, the following: uncertainty of production, development plans and cost estimates for the Marigold mine, the Seabee Gold Operation, Puna Operations and our projects; our ability to replace Mineral Reserves; our ability to obtain necessary permits for the Chinchillas project; commodity price fluctuations; political or economic instability and unexpected regulatory changes; currency and interest rate fluctuations; the possibility of future losses; general economic conditions; fully realizing the value of our shareholdings in SilverCrest Metals Inc. and our other marketable securities, due to changes in price, liquidity or disposal cost of such marketable securities; counterparty and market risks related to the sale of our concentrate and metals; uncertainty in the accuracy of Mineral Reserves and Mineral Resources estimates and in our ability to extract mineralization profitably; differences in U.S. and Canadian practices for reporting Mineral Reserves and Mineral Resources; lack of suitable infrastructure or damage to existing infrastructure; future development risks, including start-up delays and cost overruns; our ability to obtain adequate financing for further exploration and development programs and opportunities; uncertainty in acquiring additional commercially mineable mineral rights; delays in obtaining or failure to obtain governmental permits, or non-compliance with our permits; our ability to attract and retain qualified personnel and management; potential labour unrest, including labour actions by our unionized employees at Puna Operations; the impact of governmental regulations, including health, safety and environmental regulations, including increased costs and restrictions on operations due to compliance with such regulations; reclamation and closure requirements for our mineral properties; failure to effectively manage our tailings facilities; social and economic changes following closure of a mine, may lead to adverse impacts and unrest; unpredictable risks and hazards related to the development and operation of a mine or mineral property that are beyond our control; indigenous peoples' title claims and rights to consultation and accommodation may affect our existing operations as well as development projects and future acquisitions; assessments by taxation authorities in multiple jurisdictions; claims and legal proceedings, including adverse rulings in litigation against us and/or our directors or officers; compliance with anti-corruption laws and internal controls, and increased regulatory compliance costs; complying with emerging climate change regulations and the impact of climate change, including extreme weather conditions; fully realizing our interest in deferred consideration received in connection with recent divestitures; uncertainties related to title to our mineral properties and the ability to obtain surface rights; the sufficiency of our insurance coverage; civil disobedience in the countries where our mineral properties are located; operational safety and security risks; actions required to be taken by us under human rights law; competition in the mining industry for mineral properties; our ability to complete and successfully integrate an announced acquisition; an event of default under our Notes may significantly reduce our liquidity and adversely affect our business; failure to meet covenants under our senior secured revolving credit facility; conflicts of interest that could arise from certain of our directors' and officers' involvement with other natural resource companies; information systems security threats; and those other various risks and uncertainties identified under the heading "Risk Factors" in our most recent Annual Information Form filed with the Canadian securities regulatory authorities and included in our most recent Annual Report on Form 40-F filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC").

The foregoing list is not exhaustive of all factors and assumptions which may have been used. We cannot assure you that actual events, performance or results will be consistent with these forward-looking statements, and management's assumptions may prove to be incorrect. Our forward-looking statements reflect current expectations regarding future events and operating performance and speak only as of the date hereof and we do not assume any obligation to update forward-looking statements if circumstances or management's beliefs, expectations or opinions should change other than as required by applicable law. For the reasons set forth above, you should not place undue reliance on forward-looking statements.

All references to "\$" in this presentation are to U.S. dollars unless otherwise stated.

## Qualified Persons

Except as otherwise set out herein, the scientific and technical information contained in this presentation relating to each of the: Marigold mine has been reviewed and approved by James Frost, P.E. and James N. Carver, SME Registered Member, each of whom is a qualified person under National Instrument 43-101 – *Standards of Disclosure for Mineral Projects* ("NI 43-101") and our employee; Seabee Gold Operation has been reviewed and approved by Cameron Chapman, P.Eng., and Jeffrey Kulas, P. Geo., each of whom is a qualified person under NI 43-101 and our employee; and Puna Operations has been reviewed and approved by Bruce Butcher, P.Eng., and F. Carl Edmunds, P. Geo., each of whom is a qualified person under NI 43-101 and our employee. The qualified persons have verified the information disclosed herein, including the sampling, preparation, security and analytical procedures underlying such information, and are not aware of any significant risks and uncertainties that could be expected to affect the reliability or confidence in the information discussed herein.

## Cautionary Note to U.S. Investors

This presentation includes Mineral Reserves and Mineral Resources classification terms that comply with reporting standards in Canada and the Mineral Reserves and the Mineral Resources estimates are made in accordance with NI 43-101. NI 43-101 is a rule developed by the Canadian Securities Administrators that establishes standards for all public disclosure an issuer makes of scientific and technical information concerning mineral projects. These standards differ significantly from the requirements of the SEC set out in SEC Industry Guide 7. Consequently, Mineral Reserves and Mineral Resources information included in this presentation is not comparable to similar information that would generally be disclosed by domestic U.S. reporting companies subject to the reporting and disclosure requirements of the SEC. Under SEC standards, mineralization may not be classified as a "reserve" unless the determination has been made that the mineralization could be economically produced or extracted at the time the reserve determination is made. In addition, the SEC's disclosure standards normally do not permit the inclusion of information concerning "Measured Mineral Resources," "Indicated Mineral Resources" or "Inferred Mineral Resources" or other descriptions of the amount of mineralization in mineral deposits that do not constitute "reserves" by U.S. standards in documents filed with the SEC.

## Cautionary Note Regarding Non-GAAP Measures


This presentation includes certain terms or performance measures commonly used in the mining industry that are not defined under International Financial Reporting Standards ("IFRS"), including cash costs and AISC per payable ounce of precious metals sold, realized metal prices, adjusted attributable income (loss) before tax, adjusted attributable net income (loss), adjusted basic attributable income (loss) per share, operating income and working capital. Non-GAAP financial measures do not have any standardized meaning prescribed under IFRS and, therefore, they may not be comparable to similar measures reported by other companies. We believe that, in addition to conventional measures prepared in accordance with IFRS, certain investors use this information to evaluate our performance. The data presented is intended to provide additional information and should not be considered in isolation or as a substitute for measures of performance prepared in accordance with IFRS. These non-GAAP measures should be read in conjunction with our consolidated financial statements. Readers should refer to our management's discussion and analysis, available under our corporate profile at [www.sedar.com](http://www.sedar.com) or on our website at [www.ssrmining.com](http://www.ssrmining.com), under the heading "Non-GAAP Financial Measures" for a more detailed discussion of how we calculate such measures.

# A Track Record of Creating Value

## ~400,000 oz AuEq

2019 gold equivalent production

Achieved production guidance seven consecutive years




100% of Gold  
Production is  
North America-  
based

## \$1.7B market cap

Strong institutional shareholding with good daily trading liquidity

~\$420M of cash on hand

- 
- Operating Mines
  - Advanced Projects

Notes: Gold equivalent production is presented on 100% basis and is calculated with silver converted to gold equivalent at a 81:1 ratio. Market capitalization is as at February 20, 2019 and cash position is as at December 31, 2018. Please see "Cautionary Notes" in this presentation.

# Strategy for Mining Companies is Simple ...


Execution is the hard part



- **Maximize the value of our existing assets**
  - 'Operational Excellence' is embedded in our organization and is non-negotiable
  - Investment in brownfields exploration
  - Portfolio rationalization to focus only on the assets that can add value
- **Growth of production units is essential to create shareholder value**
  - M+A: we are constantly evaluating external growth options
  - Greenfields exploration

# Track Record of Growth and Decreasing Costs


Near-term production growth to +440,000 AuEq by 2021



Notes: Production and cash costs are reported on a co-product and attributable basis. Production and cash costs for 2018 reflect actual production as reported in our news release dated February 21, 2019. Production and cash costs for 2019 reflect the mid-point of 2019 guidance as reported in our news release dated January 15, 2019. Production and cash costs for each of the 2020-2021 periods for each operation are based on the Marigold updated life of mine reported in our news release dated June 18, 2018, the Seabee Gold Operation PEA as reported in our news release dated September 7, 2017 and the Puna Operations PFS as reported in our news release dated May 31, 2017. Gold equivalent ounces have been established using the realized silver prices in the respective years, and applicable Mineral Reserve prices for 2019-2021. Realized metal prices and cash costs are non-GAAP financial measures. Please see "Cautionary Note Regarding Non-GAAP Measures" in this presentation.

# Track Record of Strong Financial Performance

Liquidity to support long-term growth profile




Note: SSR Mining's "Cash Balance" is cash and cash equivalents as per financial statements as at each respective quarterly or annual date.

# Track Record of Value Creation through M+A


'OE' and mine life extension have been key to our success

## Marigold Mine



- Increased production to +200,000 oz/yr
- Decreased mining unit costs
- Extended mineral reserve and mine life

## Seabee Gold Operation



- Increasing throughput to 1,050 tpd
- Increased reserve tonnage to 2.0MT
- Enhanced reserve grade of +9 g/t gold

Notes: "Acquisition Cost" refers to announced transaction value for Marigold and Valmy, and Claude Resources. "Realized Value" reflects pre-tax free cash flow in the periods subsequent to the acquisition by SSRM as of December 31, 2018 plus analyst consensus net asset value as of February 8, 2019.



# Track Record of Growing Net Asset Value Per Share




Notes: Peer index represents an equal weighted index, indexed to SSR Mining NAV per share beginning December 31, 2014 and ending February 4, 2019. Peer index includes Alamos Gold, Kirkland Lake, Coeur, Hecla, Tahoe Resources, OceanaGold, Torex Gold, New Gold, B2 Gold, Detour Gold, Eldorado Gold and Fortuna. Source: Capital IQ.


# Track Record of Delivery

Met or exceeded guidance for seven consecutive years

## Reliable trend of delivering more gold...



## ...at lower cash costs with less variability



Notes: Gold Eq. ounces have been established using the realized silver price and the weighted average realized gold price at each of our operations in the respective years and applied to the recovered metal content of the gold and silver ounces produced, as applicable. Realized metal prices and cash costs are non-GAAP financial measures. Please see "Cautionary Note Regarding Non-GAAP Measures" in this presentation.

# 2019 Production and Cash Costs Guidance



|   | Marigold            | Seabee              | Puna<br>(75% attributable interest)                | SSR Mining<br>(75% attributable interest)    |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|
|   | Gold                | Gold                | Silver   | Gold Equivalent                              |
| Production  | 200K – 220K oz      | 95K – 110K oz       | 6.0M – 7.0M oz<br>(4.5M – 5.3M oz)                 | 370K – 415K oz<br>(350K – 395K oz)           |
| Cash Costs (US\$/oz)                                  | \$750/oz – \$790/oz | \$525/oz – \$555/oz | \$8.00/oz – \$10.00/oz<br>(\$8.00/oz – \$10.00/oz) | \$670/oz – \$730/oz<br>(\$670/oz – \$730/oz) |
| Sustaining Capital Expenditures (\$M)                 | \$35M               | \$25M               | \$12M<br>(\$9M)                                    | \$72M<br>(\$69M)                             |
| Capitalized Stripping / Capitalized Development (\$M) | \$20M               | \$12M               | \$20M<br>(\$15M)                                   | \$52M<br>(\$47M)                             |
| Exploration Expenditures (\$M)                        | \$7.5M              | \$6M                | \$1M<br>(\$0.8M)                                   | \$14.5M<br>(\$14.3M)                         |

## Consolidated Guidance

**Mid-point of 395,000 oz AuEq at cash costs of \$700/oz**

Notes: Puna Operations 2019 production guidance for lead and zinc is 20.0 to 26.0 million pounds and 15.0 to 20.0 million pounds, respectively, on a 100% consolidated basis. Please see our news release dated January 15, 2019. Gold equivalent production and cash costs are based on a 81:1 gold to silver ratio. Cash costs is a non-GAAP financial measure. Please see "Cautionary Note Regarding Non-GAAP Measures" in this presentation.

# Highest Corporate Governance Rating Leads Peer Group

Depth of experience at senior management and Board level



| Company Name                | Market Data      | ISS Data      |                 |              |                    |                        |
|-----------------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------------|------------------------|
|                             | Market Cap (\$B) | Quality Score | Board Structure | Compensation | Shareholder Rights | Audit & Risk Oversight |
| SSR Mining Inc.             | \$1.7            | 1             | 1               | 1            | 1                  | 2                      |
| Kirkland Lake Gold Ltd.     | \$7.0            | 7             | 5               | 6            | 7                  | 2                      |
| Pan American Silver Corp.   | \$2.3            | 5             | 7               | 6            | 1                  | 2                      |
| OceanaGold Corporation      | \$2.1            | 7             | 6               | 5            | 7                  | 2                      |
| Alamos Gold Inc.            | \$1.9            | 3             | 2               | 8            | 1                  | 2                      |
| Detour Gold Corporation     | \$1.9            | 1             | 1               | 3            | 1                  | 2                      |
| Hecla Mining Company        | \$1.4            | 4             | 2               | 6            | 6                  | 1                      |
| First Majestic Silver Corp. | \$1.3            | 8             | 6               | 10           | 6                  | 2                      |
| Coeur Mining, Inc.          | \$1.1            | 1             | 1               | 3            | 1                  | 2                      |
| Torex Gold Resources Inc.   | \$1.0            | 5             | 4               | 5            | 6                  | 2                      |
| Eldorado Gold Corporation   | \$0.7            | 5             | 2               | 9            | 1                  | 2                      |
| New Gold Inc.               | \$0.5            | 5             | 2               | 6            | 6                  | 2                      |
| Guyana Goldfields Inc.      | \$0.2            | 4             | 5               | 6            | 1                  | 1                      |
| Premier Gold Mines Limited  | \$0.3            | 7             | 5               | 8            | 6                  | 2                      |
| Argonaut Gold Inc.          | \$0.3            | 2             | 1               | 6            | 1                  | 2                      |
| Peer Average                | \$1.6            | 5             | 4               | 6            | 4                  | 2                      |

Source: BMO Capital Markets and ISS as of August 22, 2018. Market Cap from Capital IQ as February 20, 2019.





# MARIGOLD MINE


## GROWTH IN NEVADA





# Marigold: Large Scale, Low-Cost Producer


- Open pit, run-of-mine heap leach gold operation
- ~200,000 tonnes of material moved per day
- Strong safety and environmental practices
- Significant exploration upside
- 10-year Mineral Reserves life with potential to extend  
*(subject to the current EIS process)*
- 2019 production and cost guidance
  - Gold production of 210,000 oz
  - Cash costs of \$750/oz to \$790/oz gold
- 2018 gold production of 205,161 oz at cash costs of \$723/oz




# Creating Value by Extending Mine Life

Mineral reserves replacement at \$30/oz gold

## Production growth and improving cash costs ...



## ... with reserve replacement at an increased gold grade of 0.47g/t




Notes: 2019 production and cash costs reflect 2019 guidance as reported in our news release dated February 21, 2019. Production and cash costs for each of the 2020-2022 periods are based on the Marigold updated life of mine plan as reported in our news release dated June 18, 2018.

Notes: Measured and Indicated gold Mineral Resources are inclusive of Mineral Reserves. Please refer to "Cautionary Notes" and "Reserves and Resources: Notes to Table" in this presentation.





# Marigold: Exploration Success and Resource Conversion





# Marigold: Exploration Success and Resource Conversion

Red Dot Phase I added Mineral Reserves of 350,000oz of gold



# Growth Options with Potential Resource Conversion

In 2019, evaluate mine fleet via equipment replacement study

## Red Dot Conversion

|                              |          | Expansion                             | YE 2018 R+R                          |
|------------------------------|----------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Material Movement            | Mtpa     | +110                                  | +80                                  |
| Life of Mine (active mining) | years    | 10 - 15                               | 10 - 15                              |
| Resource Conversion          | yes/no   | Yes                                   | Yes                                  |
| Gold Production              | oz/yr    | Up to 300,000                         | +210,000                             |
| Mining Cost                  | \$/tonne | <\$1.30                               | \$1.50                               |
| Mine Fleet Investment Plan   | --       | Add rope shovel, trucks, support gear | Replace with like-for-like equipment |
| Equipment Capex              | \$M      | LOMP + ~\$100                         | LOMP                                 |

Notes: "LOMP" refers to life of mine plan. Red Dot conversion scenario parameters are targets only and do not reflect actual results or demonstrate actual economic viability. There is no certainty that such parameters will be reflected in the Red Dot conversion scenarios or that the results of such scenarios will be realized by us. Please see "Cautionary Notes" in this presentation.



# Marigold: Opportunities

- Continue to deliver production growth and robust operating margins
- Additional hauling capacity and equipment replacement study
- Mine-life extension through exploration at Mackay, Valmy, Basalt and Red Dot
  - 2019 exploration budget of \$7.5M
- Deep sulphide exploration







# SEABEE GOLD OPERATION

## HIGH-GRADE GOLD MINE



# Seabee: Overview

High-margin underground operation in a stable jurisdiction



- High-grade, underground mine in Saskatchewan, Canada
  - Strong safety and environmental practices
  - Large underexplored land position of +57,000 ha
  - Track-record of Mineral Resources conversion and growth
- 2019 production and cost guidance
  - Gold production of 102,500 oz
  - Cash costs of \$525/oz to \$555/oz gold
- Record 2018 gold production of 95,602 oz at cash costs of \$505/oz




Notes: Please see our news release dated February 21, 2019. Cash costs is a non-GAAP financial measure. Please see "Cautionary Note Regarding Non-GAAP Measures" in this presentation.



# Seabee Mineral Reserves and Resources Increased Y-o-Y


Mineral Reserves gold grade is 9.2 g/t



Notes: Mineral Reserves are based on \$1,250/oz gold price assumption. Proven and Probable Mineral Reserves have a gold grade of 9.2 g/t. Measured and Indicated gold Mineral Resources are inclusive of Mineral Reserves. Mineral Resources are based on \$1,400/oz gold price assumption. Measured and Indicated Mineral Resources have a gold grade of 11.6 g/t. Inferred Mineral Resources have a grade of 8.8 g/t. Please refer to "Cautionary Notes" and "Reserves and Resources: Notes to Table" in this presentation.

# Fifth Consecutive Annual Production Record in 2018

Low cash costs of ~\$500/oz gold




Notes: 2019 production reflects 2019 guidance and cash costs for 2019 reflect the mid-point of 2019 guidance as reported in our news release dated February 21, 2019. Production and cash costs for each of the 2019-2021 periods is based on the Seabee Gold Operation PEA as reported in our news release dated September 7, 2017. The Seabee Gold Operation PEA is preliminary in nature and includes Inferred Mineral Resources that are considered too speculative geologically to have the economic considerations applied to them that would enable them to be categorized as Mineral Reserves, and there is no certainty that the Seabee Gold Operation PEA will be realized. Cash costs is a non-GAAP financial measure. Please see "Cautionary Note Regarding Non-GAAP Measures" in this presentation.



# Operational Excellence Driving Seabee Mill Improvements

Higher 2019 milling rates driven by increased UG mine capacity



# Increased Mine Capacity Targeted for 2019

UG mining and ore transport equipment awaiting ice road delivery



↑ 6-cubic yard LHD machine


45-tonne articulated dump truck →





# Seabee: Exploration Extends Reserves Near Infrastructure


Track record of resource conversion and discovery



Notes See our news releases dated November 6, 2018 and February 21, 2019 for further details.

# Large, Contiguous Land Package

## Testing +15km of shear zone strike length



# Seabee: Opportunities

- Deliver on PEA expansion case to 1,050 tpd
- Drive Operational Excellence initiatives
- Evaluate 1,200 tpd sustained mill throughput
- 2019 exploration budget of \$6M
  - Santoy Gap hanging wall
  - Santoy 8A
  - Fisher property
- Focused on Mineral Resources conversion and discovery

Note: The Seabee Gold Operation PEA is preliminary in nature and includes Inferred Mineral Resources that are considered too speculative geologically to have the economic considerations applied to them that would enable them to be categorized as Mineral Reserves, and there is no certainty that the Seabee Gold Operation PEA will be realized. Please refer to our news release dated September 7, 2017 for further details.







# PUNA OPERATIONS

## LARGE-SCALE SILVER PRODUCER





# Puna Operations Joint Venture

Ramp-up in 2019 to steady-state silver production of +6Moz per year



- SSR Mining is the JV operator with a 75% interest
  - JV includes Chinchillas, a silver-lead-zinc deposit, and the Pirquitas plant and facilities located 45 km away
- Declared commercial production December 1, 2018
- Pirquitas plant capacity 5,000 tpd, with an operating life through +2025
- Produced 3.7M oz silver and 8.8M lbs zinc in 2018
- Enhancing our exploration efforts at the Pirquitas property
  - H1 2019 to complete drone-based aeromagnetic interpretation
  - 2019 exploration budget of \$1M



Pirquitas Operation  
Jujuy, Argentina  
Chinchillas Project  
Jujuy, Argentina

# Puna Ops: Delivering Silver Production Growth in 2019


Significant LOM base metals exposure from lead and zinc



## 2019 Guidance

- Attributable Production:
  - Silver: 4.5M to 5.3M oz
  - Lead: 15.0M to 19.5M lbs
  - Zinc: 11.3M to 15.0M lbs
- Cash costs:
  - \$8.00/oz to \$10.00/oz silver

## Medium Term Outlook



Notes: Please see our news release dated January 15, 2019. Base metals exposure of 28% based on value of metal produced from the Puna Operations PFS. Cash costs for 2019 reflect the mid-point guidance as reported in our news release dated February 21, 2019, and are presented on an attributable co-product basis. Production and cash costs for each of the 2019-2021 periods is based on the Puna Operations PFS as reported in our news release dated May 31, 2017 and are presented on an attributable co-product basis. Production is reported on a 75% basis. Silver-equivalent production calculated using Mineral Reserves prices for 2018-2021. Cash costs is a non-GAAP financial measure. Please see "Cautionary Note Regarding Non-GAAP Measures" in this presentation.

# Advancing the Las Chispas High-Grade Ag-Au Deposit

## SilverCrest Metals Inc. (TSXV - SIL) well funded to execute plan



- Inferred Mineral Resource of 4.3MT grading 3.7 g/t Au and 347.0 g/t Ag
- DDH BA18-122: 9.3 meters grading 39.7 g/t Au and 3,361 g/t Ag
- Exploration prospectivity remains attractive
- Management team with a track-record of discovery and development
- SSR Mining controls 8.2M shares (9.6% interest) in SIL
- Updated Mineral Resources estimate and PEA 1H 2019

Las Chispas Project  
Sonora, Mexico



DDH BA17-51: 3.1 meters grading  
40.5 g/t Au and 5,375 g/t Ag



Notes: Mineral Resources estimate as reported by SilverCrest Metals Inc. ("SIL") in its news release dated September 19, 2018 and technical report entitled, "Technical Report and Updated Mineral or Resource Estimate for the Las Chispas Property, Sonora, Mexico", dated November 19, 2018, with an effective date of September 13, 2018 (the "Technical Report"), available on SEDAR at [www.sedar.com](http://www.sedar.com) under SIL's profile and on its website at [www.silvercrestmetals.com](http://www.silvercrestmetals.com). Mineral Resources were prepared by SIL in accordance with NI 43-101 under the supervision of a qualified person. As discussed in the Technical Report, AgEq based on 75 (Ag):1 (Au), calculated using long-term silver and gold prices of \$18.50 per ounce silver and \$1,225 per ounce gold with average metallurgical recoveries of 86.6% silver and 98.9% gold. Mineral Resources that are not Mineral Reserves do not have demonstrated economic viability. Inferred Mineral Resources have a great amount of uncertainty as to their existence and as to whether they can be mined legally or economically. There is no assurance that all or part of the Inferred Mineral Resources can be upgraded to a higher category. Drill hole data as reported by SIL in its news releases dated January 22, 2018 and January 9, 2019. Please see "Cautionary Notes" in this presentation.



# SSR Mining: Investment Highlights

Delivering value and growth for our shareholders



**Production Growth:** Increasing near-term gold production to +440,000 oz by 2021 at \$615/oz cash costs

**Management Discipline:** Top governance rating and a track record of disciplined M+A and capital allocation

**Financial Strength:** Strong liquidity position with ~\$420M of cash

**Seabee Opportunities:** Ramping up to 1,050 tpd and exploring prospective Santoy Gap area, plus nearby Fisher project

**Marigold Upside Potential:** Upgrading a portion of Red Dot Phase I Mineral Resources as we evaluate equipment replacement study options

**Puna Targets Steady-State:** Commercial production declared December 2018 with ramp up in H1 2019



# Value & Growth



# Selected Financial Results for 2017 and 2018




|   | Units | 2018            | 2017    |
|---|-------|-----------------|---------|
| <b>Gold Sales</b>                                     | oz    | <b>290,294</b>  | 286,279 |
| <b>Silver Sales</b>                                   | Moz   | <b>3.8</b>      | 6.0     |
| <b>Total Gold Equivalent Sales</b>                    | oz    | <b>335,267</b>  | 364,538 |
| <b>Gold Equivalent Production</b>                     | oz    | <b>347,090</b>  | 370,486 |
| <b>Revenue</b>  | \$M   | <b>\$420.7</b>  | \$448.8 |
| <b>Income from Mine Operations</b>                    | \$M   | <b>\$76.8</b>   | \$113.3 |
| <b>Net (Loss) Income</b>                              | \$M   | <b>\$(0.03)</b> | \$71.5  |
| <b>Attributable Net Income</b>                        | \$M   | <b>\$6.4</b>    | \$69.3  |
| <b>Basic Attributable Earnings per share</b>          | \$    | <b>\$0.05</b>   | \$0.58  |
| <b>Adjusted Attributable Net Income</b>               | \$M   | <b>\$28.0</b>   | \$40.1  |
| <b>Adjusted Basic Attributable Earnings per share</b> | \$    | <b>\$0.23</b>   | \$0.34  |
| <b>Cash Generated by Operating Activities</b>         | \$M   | <b>\$59.8</b>   | \$144.7 |
| <b>Cash and Cash Equivalents</b>                      | \$M   | <b>\$419.2</b>  | \$459.9 |

Notes: Silver sales and gold equivalent sales are on a 100% basis. Gold equivalent sales are based on total gold and silver sales and the realized silver and gold prices for each corresponding period. Realized metal prices, adjusted attributable net income and adjusted basic attributable earnings per share are non-GAAP financial measures. Please see "Cautionary Note Regarding Non-GAAP Measures" in this presentation.

# Leader in Productivity and Utilization

## Marigold rope shovel

PreVail Fleet Comparison




Notes: Marigold 4100 XPC-AC Rope Shovel compared to information provided by Joy Global benchmark study for the period January 1, 2019 to February 1, 2019 with respect to rope shovel operating practices at certain precious, base metal and diamond mines.



# Marigold Mine: Heap Leach Process

- Once ore is loaded on the heap leach pad ...
  - Average time to achieve primary recovery of +50% is 90 to 120 days
  - Average time to achieve overall recovery of 73% is seven to nine months
- Most important factor to leach recovery time is loaded ore to 'plastic' distance
  - Every 100 feet of pad height extends leach recovery time by ~120 days



# Aerial View of Marigold Mine



# Seabee: Preliminary Economic Assessment

## Expanded margins from higher throughput and grade



- Increases mining rate by 21% to 1,050 tpd by 2019, compared to 2016
- Mines 62% of Inferred Mineral Resources
- Increases estimated LOM average gold production by 29% to 100,000 ounces per year *(for the period 2018 to 2023, compared to 2016)*
- Utilizes current infrastructure to allow for lower project capital of \$90M over seven years
- LOM estimated cash costs of \$548 per payable ounce gold sold
- Pre-tax NPV(5%) of \$364M *(\$1,300 gold price)*
- After-tax NPV(5%) of \$292M *(\$1,300 gold price)*

Notes: The Seabee Gold Operation PEA is preliminary in nature and includes Inferred Mineral Resources that are considered too speculative geologically to have the economic considerations applied to them that would enable them to be categorized as Mineral Reserves, and there is no certainty that the Seabee Gold Operation PEA will be realized. Please refer to our news release dated September 7, 2017 for further details. Cash costs is a non-GAAP financial measure. Please see "Cautionary Note Regarding Non-GAAP Measures" in this presentation.

# Seabee: PEA Financial Summary and Sensitivity Analysis



| Cash Flows (\$M)             |                   |
|------------------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Net Revenue</b>           | <b>\$893.5</b>    |
| Operating Costs              | \$(346.0)         |
| Royalties and Other          | \$(28.5)          |
| Δ in Working Capital         | \$10.3            |
| <b>Operating Cash Flow</b>   | <b>\$529.3</b>    |
| Capital Costs                | \$(89.5)          |
| Reclamation                  | \$(7.2)           |
| <b>Pre-Tax Cash Flow</b>     | <b>\$432.7</b>    |
| Tax                          | \$(86.0)          |
| <b>Post-tax Cash Flow</b>    | <b>\$346.7</b>    |
| <b>NPV5% (pre-tax)</b>       | <b>\$363.5</b>    |
| <b>NPV5% (post-tax)</b>      | <b>\$292.0</b>    |
| Gold price                   | \$1,300 per ounce |
| Exchange rate (2019 onwards) | C\$1.25:US\$1.00  |

| Pre-tax NPV (5%) Sensitivities (\$M) |        |                    |              |         |
|--------------------------------------|--------|--------------------|--------------|---------|
|                                      |        | Gold Price (\$/oz) |              |         |
|                                      |        | \$1,200            | \$1,300      | \$1,400 |
| Canadian Exchange Rate               | 1.20:1 | \$289              | \$346        | \$403   |
|                                      | 1.25:1 | \$307              | <b>\$364</b> | \$420   |
|                                      | 1.30:1 | \$319              | \$376        | \$433   |

| Pre-tax NPV (5%) Sensitivities (\$M) |      |                       |              |       |
|--------------------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------|-------|
|                                      |      | Site Costs (% change) |              |       |
|                                      |      | -10%                  | 0%           | 10%   |
| Infrastructure Capital (% change)    | 10%  | \$392                 | \$359        | \$326 |
|                                      | 0%   | \$396                 | <b>\$364</b> | \$331 |
|                                      | -10% | \$401                 | \$368        | \$335 |

Notes: The Seabee Gold Operation PEA is preliminary in nature and includes Inferred Mineral Resources that are considered too speculative geologically to have the economic considerations applied to them that would enable them to be categorized as Mineral Reserves, and there is no certainty that the Seabee Gold Operation PEA will be realized. Please refer to our news release dated September 7, 2017 for further details. The Canadian exchange rate is assumed to be 1.275:1 in 2017-2018 and 1.25:1 thereafter. Cash costs is a non-GAAP financial measure. Please see "Cautionary Note Regarding Non-GAAP Measures" in this presentation.



# Chinchillas Project: Data Sheet (100% Basis)

## Declared commercial production December 1, 2018

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Mine life:   | 8 years  |
| Total material mined:                              | 66.6 M tonnes  |
| Strip ratio:                                       | 4.7  |
| Processing rate:                                   | 4,000 tpd  |
| Average annual production (8 years active mining): | 6.1 Moz Silver<br>35.0 Mlb Lead<br>12.3 Mlb Zinc<br>8.4 Moz Silver Eq  |
| Total production:                                  | 51.0 Moz Silver<br>71.0 Moz Silver Eq  |
| Operating costs:                                   | \$2.88 / t mined, mining costs<br>\$15.34 / t milled, mining costs<br>\$14.72 / t milled, processing costs<br>\$7.00 / t milled, G&A costs<br>\$8.29 / t milled, ore transport & other |
| Cash costs:  | \$7.40 / oz Silver <i>(net of by-products)</i>   |
| AISC:  | \$9.75 / oz Silver <i>(net of by-products)</i>   |
| Development capital:                               | \$81 M   |
| Sustaining capital:                                | \$44 M   |
| NPV:   | \$178 M <i>(post-tax, 5%)</i>  |
| IRR:   | 29% <i>(post-tax)</i>  |



Notes: All data is as reported in the technical report entitled "NI 43-101 Technical Report Pre-feasibility Study of the Chinchillas Silver-Lead-Zinc Project Jujuy Province, Argentina" filed on May 31, 2017 and available under our profile on the SEDAR website at [www.sedar.com](http://www.sedar.com) or on our website at [www.ssrmining.com](http://www.ssrmining.com). Cash costs are net of estimated capitalized stripping over the life of mine. Metal price assumptions include \$19.50/oz silver, \$0.95/lb lead and \$1.00/lb zinc. Silver equivalent values are based on these metal price assumptions. Measured and Indicated Mineral Resources are inclusive of Mineral Reserves. Cash costs and AISC are non-GAAP measures. Please refer to "Cautionary Notes" and "Reserves and Resources: Notes to Table" in this presentation.

# Mineral Reserves

(as of December 31, 2018)



|   | Location  | Tonnes<br>millions | Silver<br>g/t | Gold<br>g/t | Lead<br>% | Zinc<br>% | SSRM<br>%<br>Interest | SSRM<br>Interest<br>Silver<br>million oz | SSRM<br>Interest<br>Gold<br>million oz |
|---|-----------|--------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| <b>Proven Mineral Reserves</b>                    |           |                    |               |             |           |           |                       |  |  |
| Seabee  | Canada    | 0.33               |               | 9.00        |           |           | 100                   |  | 0.09                                   |
| Chinchillas                                       | Argentina | 0.94               | 196           |             | 0.67      | 0.33      | 75                    | 4.5                                      |  |
| <b>Total</b>                                      |           |                    |               |             |           |           |                       | <b>4.5</b>                               | <b>0.09</b>                            |
| <b>Probable Mineral Reserves</b>                  |           |                    |               |             |           |           |                       |  |  |
| Marigold  | U.S.      | 201.50             |               | 0.47        |           |           | 100                   |  | 3.06                                   |
| Marigold Leach Pad Inventory                      | U.S.      |                    |               |             |           |           | 100                   |  | 0.24                                   |
| Seabee  | Canada    | 1.73               |               | 9.24        |           |           | 100                   |  | 0.51                                   |
| Chinchillas                                       | Argentina | 7.91               | 161           |             | 1.35      | 0.47      | 75                    | 30.7                                     |  |
| Chinchillas Stockpiles                            | Argentina | 0.60               | 157           |             | 0.96      | 0.68      | 75                    | 2.3                                      |  |
| Pirquitas Stockpiles                              | Argentina | 0.87               | 64            |             |           | 1.43      | 75                    | 1.3                                      |  |
| <b>Total</b>                                      |           |                    |               |             |           |           |                       | <b>34.3</b>                              | <b>3.81</b>                            |
| <b>Total Proven and Probable Mineral Reserves</b> |           |                    |               |             |           |           |                       |  |  |
| Marigold  | U.S.      | 201.50             |               | 0.47        |           |           | 100                   |  | 3.06                                   |
| Marigold Leach Pad Inventory                      | U.S.      |                    |               |             |           |           | 100                   |  | 0.24                                   |
| Seabee  | Canada    | 2.05               |               | 9.20        |           |           | 100                   |  | 0.61                                   |
| Chinchillas                                       | Argentina | 8.85               | 165           |             | 1.28      | 0.46      | 75                    | 35.1                                     |  |
| Chinchillas Stockpiles                            | Argentina | 0.60               | 157           |             | 0.96      | 0.68      | 75                    | 2.3                                      |  |
| Pirquitas Stockpiles                              | Argentina | 0.87               | 64            |             |           | 1.43      | 75                    | 1.3                                      |  |
| <b>Total Proven and Probable</b>                  |           |                    |               |             |           |           |                       | <b>38.7</b>                              | <b>3.91</b>                            |

# Mineral Resources: Measured and Indicated

(as of December 31, 2018)



|   | Location  | Tonnes<br>millions | Silver<br>g/t | Gold<br>g/t | Lead<br>% | Zinc<br>% | SSRM<br>%<br>Interest | SSRM<br>Interest<br>Silver<br>million oz | SSRM<br>Interest<br>Gold<br>million oz |
|---|-----------|--------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| <b>Measured Mineral Resources (Inclusive of Proven Mineral Reserves)</b>        |           |                    |               |             |           |           |                       |  |  |
| Seabee  | Canada    | 0.45               |               | 11.76       |           |           | 100                   |  | 0.17                                   |
| Chinchillas   | Argentina | 2.11               | 130           |             | 0.52      | 0.39      | 75                    | 6.6                                      |  |
| Pitarrilla  | Mexico    | 12.35              | 90            |             | 0.70      | 1.22      | 100                   | 35.7                                     |  |
| <b>Total</b>  |           |                    |               |             |           |           |                       | <b>42.4</b>                              | <b>0.17</b>                            |
| <b>Indicated Mineral Resources (Inclusive of Probable Mineral Reserves)</b>     |           |                    |               |             |           |           |                       |  |  |
| Marigold  | U.S.      | 354.50             |               | 0.47        |           |           | 100                   |  | 5.32                                   |
| Marigold Leach Pad Inventory  | U.S.      |                    |               |             |           |           | 100                   |  | 0.24                                   |
| Seabee  | Canada    | 1.85               |               | 11.56       |           |           | 100                   |  | 0.69                                   |
| Chinchillas   | Argentina | 26.01              | 100           |             | 0.94      | 0.62      | 75                    | 62.5                                     |  |
| Pirquitas UG  | Argentina | 2.63               | 292           |             |           | 4.46      | 75                    | 18.6                                     |  |
| Pirquitas Stockpiles  | Argentina | 0.87               | 64            |             |           | 1.43      | 75                    | 1.3                                      |  |
| Pitarrilla  | Mexico    | 147.02             | 97            |             | 0.32      | 0.87      | 100                   | 460.7                                    |  |
| Pitarrilla UG   | Mexico    | 5.43               | 165           |             | 0.68      | 1.34      | 100                   | 28.8                                     |  |
| San Luis  | Peru      | 0.48               | 578           | 22.40       |           |           | 100                   | 9.0                                      | 0.35                                   |
| Amisk   | Canada    | 30.15              | 6             | 0.85        |           |           | 100                   | 6.0                                      | 0.83                                   |
| <b>Total</b>  |           |                    |               |             |           |           |                       | <b>586.9</b>                             | <b>7.42</b>                            |
| <b>Measured and Indicated Mineral Resources (Inclusive of Mineral Reserves)</b> |           |                    |               |             |           |           |                       |  |  |
| Marigold  | U.S.      | 354.50             |               | 0.47        |           |           | 100                   |  | 5.32                                   |
| Marigold Leach Pad Inventory  | U.S.      |                    |               |             |           |           | 100                   |  | 0.24                                   |
| Seabee  | Canada    | 2.29               |               | 11.60       |           |           | 100                   |  | 0.86                                   |
| Chinchillas   | Argentina | 28.13              | 102           |             | 0.91      | 0.60      | 75                    | 69.1                                     |  |
| Pirquitas UG  | Argentina | 2.63               | 292           |             |           | 4.46      | 75                    | 18.6                                     |  |
| Pirquitas Stockpiles  | Argentina | 0.87               | 64            |             |           | 1.43      | 75                    | 1.3                                      |  |
| Pitarrilla  | Mexico    | 159.36             | 97            |             | 0.35      | 0.89      | 100                   | 496.5                                    |  |
| Pitarrilla UG   | Mexico    | 5.43               | 165           |             | 0.68      | 1.34      | 100                   | 28.8                                     |  |
| San Luis  | Peru      | 0.48               | 578           | 22.40       |           |           | 100                   | 9.0                                      | 0.35                                   |
| Amisk   | Canada    | 30.15              | 6             | 0.85        |           |           | 100                   | 6.0                                      | 0.83                                   |
| <b>Total Measured and Indicated</b>   |           |                    |               |             |           |           |                       | <b>629.3</b>                             | <b>7.59</b>                            |



# Mineral Resources: Inferred

(as of December 31, 2018)



|                                   | Location  | Tonnes<br>millions | Silver<br>g/t | Gold<br>g/t | Lead<br>% | Zinc<br>% | SSRM<br>%<br>Interest | SSRM<br>Interest<br>Silver<br>million oz | SSRM<br>Interest<br>Gold<br>million oz |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|--------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------|--|--|
| <b>Inferred Mineral Resources</b> |           |                    |               |             |           |           |                       |  |  |
| <b>Marigold</b>                   | U.S.      | 33.60              |               | 0.37        |           |           | 100                   |  | 0.40                                   |
| <b>Seabee</b>                     | Canada    | 1.70               |               | 8.82        |           |           | 100                   |  | 0.48                                   |
| <b>Chinchillas</b>                | Argentina | 21.29              | 50            |             | 0.54      | 0.81      | 75                    | 25.7                                     |  |
| <b>Pirquitas UG</b>               | Argentina | 1.08               | 207           |             |           | 7.45      | 75                    | 5.4                                      |  |
| <b>Pitarrilla</b>                 | Mexico    | 8.52               | 77            |             | 0.18      | 0.58      | 100                   | 21.2                                     |  |
| <b>Pitarrilla UG</b>              | Mexico    | 1.23               | 138           |             | 0.89      | 1.25      | 100                   | 5.5                                      |  |
| <b>San Luis</b>                   | Peru      | 0.02               | 270           | 5.60        |           |           | 100                   | 0.2                                      | 0.00                                   |
| <b>Amisk</b>                      | Canada    | 28.65              | 4             | 0.64        |           |           | 100                   | 3.7                                      | 0.59                                   |
| <b>Total Inferred</b>             |           |                    |               |             |           |           |                       | <b>61.6</b>                              | <b>1.48</b>                            |

# Reserves and Resources

## Notes to Tables



All estimates set forth in the Mineral Reserves and Mineral Resources table have been prepared in accordance with National Instrument 43-101 - *Standards of Disclosure for Mineral Projects* ("NI 43-101"). The estimates of Mineral Reserves and Mineral Resources for each property other than the Marigold mine, the Seabee Gold Operation and the Amisk project have been reviewed and approved by Bruce Butcher, P.Eng., our Director, Mine Planning, and F. Carl Edmunds, P.Geo., our Vice President, Exploration, each of whom is a qualified person.

Mineral Resources are reported inclusive of Mineral Reserves. Mineral Resources that are not Mineral Reserves do not have demonstrated economic viability. Due to the uncertainty that may be attached to Inferred Mineral Resources, it cannot be assumed that all or any part of an Inferred Mineral Resource will be upgraded to an Indicated or Measured Mineral Resource as a result of continued exploration. Mineral Reserves and Mineral Resources estimates of silver ounces for Puna Operations, comprised of Chinchillas and Pirquitas are reported on a 75% attributable basis. Mineral Reserves and Mineral Resources figures have some rounding applied, and thus totals may not sum exactly. All ounces reported herein represent troy ounces, and "g/t" represents grams per tonne. All \$ references are in U.S. dollars. All Mineral Reserves and Mineral Resources estimates are as at December 31, 2018. Metal prices utilized for Mineral Reserves estimates are \$1,250 per ounce of gold, \$18.00 per ounce of silver, \$0.90 per pound of lead and \$1.00 per pound of zinc. Metal prices utilized for Mineral Resources estimates are \$1,400 per ounce of gold, \$20.00 per ounce of silver, \$1.10 per pound of lead and \$1.30 per pound of zinc, except as noted below for each of the Chinchillas project, the San Luis project and the Amisk project. All technical reports for the properties are available under our profile on the SEDAR website at [www.sedar.com](http://www.sedar.com) or on our website at [www.ssrmining.com](http://www.ssrmining.com).

**Marigold Mine:** Except for updates to cost parameters, all other key assumptions, parameters and methods used to estimate Mineral Reserves and Mineral Resources and the data verification procedures followed are set out in the technical report entitled "NI 43-101 Technical Report on the Marigold Mine, Humboldt County, Nevada" dated July 31, 2018 (the "Marigold Technical Report"). For additional information about the Marigold mine, readers are encouraged to review the Marigold Technical Report. Mineral Reserves estimate was prepared under the supervision of James Frost, P.E., a qualified person and our Technical Services Superintendent at the Marigold mine, and is reported at a cut-off grade of 0.065 g/t payable gold. Mineral Resources estimate was prepared under the supervision of James N. Carver, SME Registered Member, our Chief Geologist at the Marigold mine, and Karthik Rathnam, MAusIMM (CP), our Resource Manager, Corporate, each of whom is a qualified person. Mineral Resources estimate is reported based on an optimized pit shell at a cut-off grade of 0.065 g/t payable gold, and includes an estimate of Mineral Resources for mineralized stockpiles using Inverse Distance cubed.

**Seabee Gold Operation:** Except for updates to cost parameters, mill recovery and dilution to include recent operating results, and resource modeling techniques based on recommendations set forth in the technical report entitled "NI 43-101 Technical Report for the Seabee Gold Operation, Saskatchewan, Canada" dated October 20, 2017 (the "Seabee Gold Operation Technical Report"), all other key assumptions, parameters and methods used to estimate Mineral Reserves and Mineral Resources and the data verification procedures followed are set out in the Seabee Gold Operation Technical Report. For additional information about the Seabee Gold Operation, readers are encouraged to review the Seabee Gold Operation Technical Report. Mineral Reserves estimate was prepared under the supervision of Kevin Fitzpatrick, P.Eng., a qualified person and our Engineering Supervisor at the Seabee Gold Operation. Mineral Reserves estimate for the Santoy mine is reported at a cut-off grade of 3.31 g/t gold. Mineral Resources estimate was prepared under the supervision of Jeffrey Kulas, P.Geo., a qualified person and our Manager Geology, Mining Operations at the Seabee Gold Operation. Block modeling techniques were used for Mineral Resources and Mineral Reserves evaluation for the Santoy mine and Porky West deposits. The preliminary economic assessment set forth in the Seabee Gold Operation Technical Report is preliminary in nature, and it includes Inferred Mineral Resources that are considered too speculative geologically to have the economic considerations applied to them that would enable them to be categorized as Mineral Reserves, and there is no certainty that the preliminary economic assessment will be realized.

**Puna Operations:** Chinchillas Mineral Reserves estimate is reported at a cut-off grade of \$37.80 per tonne net smelter return ("NSR"). For additional information on the key assumptions, parameters and methods used to estimate Chinchillas Mineral Reserves and the data verification procedures followed, readers are encouraged to review the technical report entitled "NI 43-101 Technical Report Pre-feasibility Study of the Chinchillas Silver-Lead-Zinc Project, Jujuy Province, Argentina" dated May 15, 2017 (the "Chinchillas Technical Report"). Chinchillas Mineral Resources estimate is reported at a base case cut-off grade, which reflects the transport to and processing of ore at the Pirquitas plant, of 60.00 grams per tonne silver equivalent based on projected operating costs and using metal price assumptions of \$22.50 per ounce of silver, \$1.00 per pound of lead and \$1.10 per pound of zinc. For additional information on the key assumptions, parameters and methods used to estimate Chinchillas Mineral Resources and the data verification procedures followed, readers are encouraged to review the Chinchillas Technical Report. Pirquitas underground Mineral Resources (Pirquitas UG) estimate is reported below the completed open pit shell; Mineral Resources estimate for the Mining Area (which includes San Miguel, Chocaya, Oploca and Potosí zones) is reported at a cut-off grade of \$100.00 per tonne NSR for San Miguel, Oploca and Potosí, and \$90.00 per tonne NSR for Cortaderas. Pirquitas Mineral Reserves and Pirquitas Mineral Resources estimates in surface stockpiles are reported at a cut-off grade of \$20.00 per tonne NSR, respectively, and were determined based on grade, rehandling costs and recovery estimates from metallurgical testing.

**San Luis Project:** Mineral Resources estimate is reported at a cut-off grade of 6.0 g/t gold equivalent, using metal price assumptions of \$600 per ounce of gold and \$9.25 per ounce of silver.

**Pitarrilla Project:** Mineral Resources estimate for the open pit is reported at a cut-off grade of \$16.38 per tonne NSR for direct leach material, and \$16.40 per tonne NSR for flotation/leach material. Underground Mineral Resources (Pitarrilla UG) estimate is reported below the constrained open pit resource shell above a cut-off grade of \$80.00 per tonne NSR, using grade shells that have been trimmed to exclude distal and lone blocks that would not support development costs.

**Amisk Project:** Mineral Resources estimate was prepared by Sebastien Bernier, P.Geo., a qualified person. Mineral Resources estimate is reported at a cut-off grade of 0.40 grams of gold equivalent per tonne using metal price assumptions of \$1,100 per ounce of gold and \$16.00 per ounce of silver inside conceptual pit shells optimized using metallurgical and process recovery of 87%, overall ore mining and processing costs of \$15.00 per tonne and overall pit slope of fifty-five degrees.

# SSR Mining Executive Team and Board of Directors

Depth of experience and a top governance rating



**Paul Benson**  
President and CEO



**Nadine J. Block**  
SVP, Human Resources



**W. John DeCooman, Jr.**  
SVP, Business Development  
and Strategy



**Gregory J. Martin**  
SVP and CFO



**Kevin O'Kane**  
SVP and COO



**Michael Anglin**  
Chairman



**Brian Booth**  
Director



**Gustavo Herrero**  
Director



**Richard Paterson**  
Director



**Steven Reid**  
Director



**Simon Fish**  
Director



**Beverlee Park**  
Director



**Elizabeth Wademan**  
Director



**Paul Benson**  
Director, President and CEO



**First decile corporate governance rating leads peer group**



# SSR Mining Inc.

## Share capital structure, convertible note and top shareholders overview




### Top 10 Shareholders

### % of Shares Outstanding


|   |       |
|---|-------|
| Van Eck                                   | 14.7% |
| Dimensional Fund Advisors, L.P.           | 5.1%  |
| Renaissance Technologies                  | 4.8%  |
| Investec Asset Management                 | 4.2%  |
| Connor Clark & Lunn Investment Management | 2.7%  |
| Norges Bank Investment Management         | 2.6%  |
| The Vanguard Group Inc.                   | 2.5%  |
| Global X Management Company               | 1.5%  |
| Sun Valley Gold                           | 1.5%  |
| Ruffer LLP                                | 1.4%  |

### Institutional Holdings by Country



- United States
- Canada
- United Kingdom
- Other

Holding by Investor Class: 67% Institutional  
33% Retail and Other



### \$ Million

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| Cash and Cash Equivalents               | \$419   |
| Marketable Securities                   | \$30    |
| Convertible Notes                       | \$265   |
| Credit Facility (\$75M, undrawn)        | -       |
| Market Capitalization                   | \$1,673 |
| Total Shares Outstanding: 120.7 million |         |

Source: Capital IQ, Ipreo; as at February 20, 2019. Cash and cash equivalents, marketable securities, convertible notes, revolving credit facility and total shares outstanding as at December 31, 2018. Market capitalization as at February 20, 2019.



SSR Mining Inc.  
[www.ssrmining.com](http://www.ssrmining.com)

Toll-free: +1 888.338.0046  
Telephone: +1 604.689.3846  
Email: [invest@ssrmining.com](mailto:invest@ssrmining.com)