



Objection

Objector:	Mr Conor Gaffney
Organisation Name:	BOLIDEN TARA MINES LTD.
Objector Address:	KNOCKUMBER, NAVAN, Co. Meath.
Objection Title:	Objection #OS012251 - Applicant objection for Reg No:[P0516-05]
Objection Reference No.:	OS012251
Objection Received:	22 January 2026
Objector Type:	Applicant
Oral Hearing Requested?	No

Application

Applicant:	Boliden Tara Mines Designated Activity Company
Reg. No.:	P0516-05

See below for Objection details.

Attachments are displayed on the following page(s).

22nd January 2026

Boliden Tara Mines (BTM) DAC wishes to make the following submission in relation to 20 conditions of the Agency's Proposed Determination (PD) Register Number P0516-05.

The PD was issued following the Company's application for review of existing Industrial Emissions Licence (IEL) P0516-04.

1. Licensee Submission to Condition: 3.6.3

“The licensee must install on all emission points, sampling points or equipment, all data logging or other electronic communication equipment, as required by the Agency”

Response

BTM proposes to amend the text of condition 3.6.3 to the following

*“The licensee shall install on all emission points, sampling points or equipment, data logging or other electronic communication equipment, in **agreement** with the Agency”*

Justification/ Reasoning

The requirement for BTM to install data logging and electronic communication equipment on all emission points, sampling points, or equipment places a significant and potentially unworkable burden on the company. In many instances, installation at every location may not be feasible due to constraints such as landowner access restrictions, technical limitations, or financial considerations.

The proposed amendment is intended to promote a collaborative approach and ensure that any instrumentation installed is technically viable, appropriate and financially feasible for BTM to implement.

2. Licensee Submission to Condition: 3.7

“In the case of composite sampling of aqueous emissions from the installation, a separate composite sample or homogeneous sub-sample (of sufficient volume as advised) must be refrigerated without delay after collection and retained as required for Agency use”.

Response / Reasoning

BTM proposes the amend the text of condition 3.7 to the following

“In the case of composite sampling of aqueous emissions from the installation, a separate composite sample or homogeneous sub-sample (of sufficient volume as advised) must be refrigerated without delay after collection and retained as required for Agency use for 24 hrs following sampling.

It is proposed that a defined timeframe is included within the above condition specifying the duration for which composite samples may be retained by the laboratory. This is proposed in the interest of clarity and to ensure samples are not retained beyond appropriate parameter-specific holding times.

3. Licensee Submission to Condition: 3.11

“The licensee must ensure a minimum freeboard of at least one meter is maintained at all times in the TMF during the lifetime of operation of the TMF”

Response / Reasoning

BTM proposes the amend the text of condition 3.11 to the following

*“The licensee must ensure a minimum **water** freeboard of at least one meter is maintained at all times in the TMF during the lifetime of operation of the TMF”*

The proposed amendment seeks to clarify that, during the operation of the TMF, the freeboard refers to water component only. This clarification is necessary to allow for the continued depositing of tailing within stages of the TMF until the intended design fill

level and surface profile is established. This is essential to ensure that the final tailings profile supports effective surface drainage both during operations and post closure.

4. Licensee Submission to Condition: 3.11.5

The licensee must implement the mitigation measures as outlined in the 'TMF - Dam Break Study' dated July 2017.

Response / Reasoning

BTM proposes to amend the text of above condition 3.11.5 to the following:
*The licensee must implement the mitigation measures as outlined in the 'TMF - Dam Break Study' dated **September 2020**.*

It is proposed to amend the above condition to refer to the most recent study completed.

5. Licensee Submission to Condition: 3.18

3.18 Mining and blasting controls

3.18.1 Blasting at nighttime must not occur.

3.18.2 Blasting must not occur between Saturday at 19:00 and Monday at 07:00.

3.18.3 There must be no blasting operations on Bank Holidays.

Response / reasoning

BTM strongly objects to the inclusion of condition 3.18 and proposes that this condition be removed.

The proposed inclusion/introduction of new restrictions on permitted blasting times is overly restrictive to established operations at BTM. Since commencement of the mining activities, normal operations have included blasting twice daily, 7 days a week, within times between 05:45 and 06:30 and 18:45 and 19:30. These practices have been carried out in full compliance of applicable noise and vibration limits, with no recorded breach of blasting-related conditions as specified in P0516-04 of previous versions of IE

licences. Strict vibration monitoring is carried out on a continuous basis using defined peak particle velocity(ppv) trigger levels at permanent and portable monitoring locations as agreed with the Agency, with no exceedances recorded. Structured vibration monitoring procedures are implemented in response to any complaints related to operations at BTM.

The proposed introduction of new/additional blasting restrictions is not supported by compliance history or environmental performance and could place the facility's long-term viability at risk.

Since recommencing operations following the care-and-maintenance period, BTM has targeted an annual production rate of 1.8 million tonnes of ore, with planned incremental increases to 2.8 million tonnes in the coming years. This is based on operational parameters that have been in place since commencement of the mine and are supported by existing planning permissions and licence conditions.

Imposing new restrictions at this stage could undermine the operational framework on which the facility was originally approved and may risk constraining operational flexibility, jeopardising the ability to meet planned production targets and continued viability of the operation.

6. Licensee Submission to Condition: 6.11

“The licensee must ensure that groundwater monitoring well sampling equipment is available or installed on-site at the installation and is fit for purpose at all times. The sampling equipment must be to Agency specifications”

Response / Reasoning

BTM proposed to amend the text of condition 6.11 to state.

*“The licensee must ensure that groundwater monitoring well sampling equipment is available or installed on-site at the installation and is fit for purpose at all times. The sampling equipment must in **agreement** with Agency.”*

The amendment is proposed to allow BTM to install sampling equipment that is technically possible, appropriate and financially feasible for BTM to install.

7. Licensee Submission to Condition: 6.11.2.3

6.11.2.3 Further to the hydrogeological review or assessment, all actions required to demonstrate compliance with the European Communities Environmental Objectives (Groundwater) Regulations 2010, SI 09/2010 as approved or otherwise required by the Agency, including the setting of groundwater compliance values if appropriate, must be implemented within the timeline specified by the Agency

Response / Reasoning

*Further to the hydrogeological review or assessment, all actions required to demonstrate compliance with the European Communities Environmental Objectives (Groundwater) Regulations 2010, SI 09/2010 as approved or otherwise required by the Agency, including the setting of groundwater compliance values if appropriate, must be implemented within **agreed timelines** with the Agency.*

It is proposed that the above condition be amended to allow for the use of “agreed timelines,” ensuring that any actions required to demonstrate compliance can be completed within reasonable and achievable timeframes. BTM relies on external specialist consultants to provide expert advice on groundwater-related aspects of its operations. Given the high demand and niche expertise required in this field, it may not always be feasible to meet the timelines specified by the Agency. To support ongoing compliance, BTM is committed to establishing realistic, proportionate and mutually agreed timelines that facilitate the most appropriate outcomes.

8. Licensee Submission to Condition: 6.11.2.4

The licensee must install new groundwater monitoring boreholes or surface water monitoring locations where necessary to characterise groundwater or water quality respectively, as required by the Agency.

Response / Reasoning

BTM proposes to amend the test of condition 6.11.2.4 to state.

*The licensee must install new groundwater monitoring boreholes or surface water monitoring locations where necessary to characterise groundwater or water quality respectively, as **agreed** with the Agency.*

The proposed amendment is intended to ensure that all monitoring locations are technically viable, appropriate to site-specific conditions, and practically achievable. A number of BTM’s monitoring points are situated on lands owned by third-party landowners, with both access and monitoring equipment installation subject to the consent of these landowners.

9. Licensee Submission to Condition: 6.11.2.5

6.11.2.5 *The licensee must establish, maintain and implement a response programme, to address any exceedance of the compliance values as approved or required by the Agency, to ensure compliance with the European Communities Environmental Objectives (Groundwater) Regulations 2010, SI 09/2010, within three months of date of grant of this licence.*

Response / reasoning

BTM proposes to amend the text of above condition 6.11.2.5 to the following:

*The licensee must establish, maintain and implement a response programme, to address any exceedance of the compliance values as approved or required by the Agency, to ensure compliance with the European Communities Environmental Objectives (Groundwater) Regulations 2010, SI 09/2010, within three months from date of **agreement of compliance points and values with the Agency.***

It is proposed to amend the above condition to state within three months of establishing compliance points and values and locations as agreed with the Agency following the completion of an updated Groundwater Risk Assessment. This is to ensure any response programme is established from the latest available data.

10. Licensee Submission to Condition: 6.17.10

*(e) monitoring at a minimum of six permanent **air overpressure** and vibration locations to the satisfaction of the Agency for each blast and at any additional location, as may be required the Agency,*

Response / Reasoning

It is proposed to remove the requirement of monitoring air overpressure from sub-clause e).

All blasting operations are carried out at significant depths underground such that the generation of air overpressure is imperceptible at surface. Any locations at which air overpressure could theoretically be emitted to the external environment would be limited to air vents or mine portal entrances, which may be located a distance away from the actual blast location. This is supported by the existing monitoring regime, whereby none of the six permanent vibration monitoring stations record air overpressure attributable to blasting activities.

11. Licensee Submission to Condition: 6.18.2.3 (c)
BTM request to amend sub-clause point c) “*extensive sprinkler system*” to allow for “*remote sprinkler systems*”

Response / Reasoning

BTM proposed to amend sub-clause point c) to allow for a remote sprinkler system that can be deployed in areas that require dust suppression as required instead of extensive sprinkler systems to allow for dampening to be deployed in areas that are required.

12. Licensee Submission to Condition: 8.11.4

The TMF must not be modified without the written approval of the Agency

Response / Reasoning

It is proposed that the Agency specify a timeframe within which any proposed modifications to the TMF must be agreed by the Agency. BTM is required to carry out regular reviews of the TMF in line with best industry standards. Following these reviews there may be legal, safety or technical requirements that necessitate modifications to the TMF within short / urgent timeframes to ensure continued safe and compliant operations. Delays in obtaining Agency agreement on proposed/necessary modifications to the TMF present a material risk that BTM may fall out of compliance

with external regulatory and industry standards governing TMF operations. In the absence of an agreed timeframe for the review and approval of such modifications, BTM remains exposed to potential non-compliance with its statutory and industry obligations that is required and critical to ensure ongoing operations.

It is imperative to BTMs operational continuity that agreement and resolution of any proposed modifications to the TMF are achieved within reasonable and practicable timeframes, in order to ensure ongoing site operations and safeguard commercial viability of the operation.

13. Licensee Submission to Condition: 8.11.8

8.11.8 All final design elements for any proposed modification to the TMF must be approved by the Agency prior to construction.

Response / Reasoning

*“All final design elements for any proposed modification to the TMF **will be agreed with** the Agency prior to construction.”*

In addition to response to sub-clause 8.11.4.

All design elements must comply with recognised and approved industry standards, which underpin compliance assessments. In circumstances where the Agency does not accept a design that aligns with established industry standards, BTM may inadvertently face an unintended risk of non-compliance. To avoid this outcome, BTM proposes advance agreement with the Agency on all design elements relating to emissions and environmental risk ensuring clarity, consistency, and regulatory alignment.

14. Licensee Submission to Condition: 8.11.9

8.11.9.2 All construction works on, or modifications to, the TMF must, where required by the Agency, be directly supervised and certified by an appropriately qualified engineer ('supervising Engineer' under the UK Reservoirs Act 1975, or equivalent)

8.11.9.4 Any modification to the TMF must be certified as 'Fit for Purpose' by an "All Reservoirs Panel Engineer" (UK Reservoirs Act 1975) or equivalent prior to commissioning.

BTM requests clarification on sub-clause 8.11.9.2 and 8.11.9.4 as to what (professional certification, regulatory regime, or statutory framework) constitutes or would be considered the “*equivalent*” of certified to UK Reservoirs Act 1975.

15. Licensee Submission to Condition; 8.11.17.1

The annual independent audit of the TMF must be equivalent to a SEED Audit,

Proposed text change to Condition 8.11.17.1

“The annual independent performance review and audit of the TMF shall be undertaken by the appointed Designer of Record (DoR)”

BTM proposes to amend the above condition to align with the Global Industry Standard on Tailings Management (GISTM) periodic and annual reporting and review framework, which BTM has formally committed to implementing at the Randalstown TMF.

This proposed amendment would remove the requirement to undertake an annual audit equivalent to a SEED audit and instead provide for compliance through the periodic and annual reporting, review and oversight mechanisms prescribed under GISTM, including the undertaking of an annual independent review and audit by the Designer of Record (DoR) and a Dam Safety Review (DSR) at a minimum frequency of once every 10 years.

Under GISTM, a Dam Safety Review (DSR) is defined as an independent, comprehensive review of a tailings facility and is considered equivalent in scope and intent to a SEED audit undertaken in accordance with Best Available Techniques (BAT). GISTM recommends that a DSR be carried out at intervals of between five and ten years, dependent on the facility's Consequence Classification.

GISTM defines a Dam Safety Review as follows:

“An independent review of the safety of a tailings facility covering technical, operational and governance aspects, conducted by an independent technical specialist according to established best practices. It should be conducted at intervals based on the Consequence Classification and the complexity of its condition or performance. It is a regulatory requirement in many jurisdictions.”

Given the depth and level of technical detail involved in a DSR, comparable to the scope of a SEED audit, which BAT guidance recommends being undertaken every 15 years, it is neither appropriate nor necessary to undertake such a review on an annual basis.

Based on the current GISTM Consequence Classification of High, BTM proposes that a DSR be undertaken at a minimum frequency of once every ten years. In accordance with GISTM recommendations, the facility's Consequence Classification and the associated DSR frequency will be formally reviewed at intervals not exceeding five years.

In addition, and in line with GISTM an Independent Reviewer (IR) has been appointed. The IR receives and reviews annual tailings performance data and undertakes a site visit every two years, providing an additional layer of independent oversight.

The appointed DoR will continue to undertake an annual independent review of the facility and issue an Annual Performance Report (APR), providing continuous and robust oversight of TMF performance between scheduled DSR's.

16. Licensee Submission to Condition; 8.11.28 (b)

“Removed from the TMF at the earliest possible time to an off-site authorised TMF”

Response / Reasoning

It is proposed to amend the above condition to state

*“Removed from the TMF at the earliest possible time to an off-site authorised **facility**”*

This amendment is to allow for the transfer of unsuitable soil and stone to an authorised treatment facility for further treatment and / or recovery.

17. Licensee Submission to Condition: 11.2

11.2 The licensee must carry out every action required by the Agency, and arising out of such reports, proposals, plans, programmes, or submissions, by such deadline as specified by the Agency. The licensee will not be in compliance with the requirements of this condition unless and until it has carried out every such action.

Response / Reasoning

*The licensee must carry out every **agreed** action required by the Agency, and arising out of such reports, proposals, plans, programmes, or submissions, by such deadline as specified by the Agency. The licensee will not be in compliance with the requirements of this condition unless and until it has carried out every **agreed** such action.*

BTM will undertake all actions as required; however, it is proposed that the condition be amended to refer to “agreed actions.” This approach would support a collaborative process in determining the appropriate measures, ensuring that any actions identified are feasible, proportionate, and capable of being effective implementation.

18. Licensee Submission to Condition: 11.9.1 sub-clause j)

11.9.1 (j) records for each blast including:

- (i) peak particle velocity,*
- (ii) air overpressure,*
- (iii) distance to each noise and vibration sensitive receptor from the blast,*
- (iv) Maximum instantaneous charge levels*

It is proposed to amend the above condition to state

- (j) “following a complaint, records for each blast including;*
- (i) peak particle velocity,*
- (ii) distance from the blast location to the complainant*
- (iii) Maximum instantaneous charge levels*

It is proposed to remove the original sub-clause ii) air overpressure, as all blasting operations are carried out at significant depths underground and the generation of air overpressure is imperceptible at surface. The only locations where air overpressure could potentially be released to the environment are air vents and mine portals which may be located a distance away from the actual blast location.

It is further proposed to amend this sub-condition to record the distance from the blast location to the complainant’s property. Given the rural setting and high number of dispersed residential developments throughout the area the mine operates, it may not be possible to accurately determine or record which properties are closest to each blast event, or to confirm the status of individual properties (derelict, occupied or their existing use).

19. Licensee Submission to Condition: Table B.9. Groundwater monitoring

Response / Reasoning

It is proposed to remove the requirement to monitor domestic wells (9R – 35R) from B.9.2 and to remove extraction rate (m³/day) as a monitoring parameter from Schedule B of P0516-05.

Monitoring of domestic wells (9R – 35R) was initiated and has been undertaken on a proactive basis by BTM in cooperation with landowners in the vicinity of the TMF. These locations have been identified through ongoing stakeholder engagement with access subject to landowner consent, which may be withdrawn or change at any time. Consequently, the continued use of these locations as monitoring points cannot be guaranteed. In addition, some wells lack essential construction details and others are older installations. As a result, they may not provide reliable or representative groundwater quality data or may no longer be accessible, and their continued use could undermine the validity of groundwater monitoring locations and groundwater quality results.

All groundwater monitoring boreholes (BR, OB, GR locations) are purpose-designed and installed solely for environmental monitoring purposes. These boreholes are not utilised for groundwater extraction, and the only groundwater flow associated with these locations occurs during purging while sampling groundwater. Water extraction from domestic wells that are still in use is solely for domestic household or farmyard supply and is independent of BTM operations

No groundwater extraction is undertaken by BTM. For this reason, BTM seeks for the removal of any reference to monitoring groundwater abstraction.

20. Licensee Submission to Condition: Table B.10 Monitoring of the Tailings Management System**Response / Reasoning**

BTM proposes the below updates (**in bold**) to Table B10.1 of schedule B, which reflects the current analysis methods and techniques used at the TMF for monitoring. BTM requests for Dam Safety Review (DSR) be added in addition to SEED audit to reflect current audit and reviews in line with the tailings management system procedures.

BTM also requests clarification on the addition of copernicium as parameters that are required to be monitored, it is assumed that this may be a typographical error and may refer to cyanide, can the Agency please confirm.

Location	Parameter	Monitoring Frequency	Analysis Method/ Techniques
TMF Pond	Water level	Weekly	Automated sensor
Piezometers in TMF embankment	Water Level / Phreatic Surface	Monthly	Dip Meter and Automated sensor
	pH, conductivity	Monthly	Electrometric
	Lead, Zinc, arsenic, iron, copper, mercury, cobalt, calcium, magnesium, manganese, cadmium, nickel, cyanide, sulphide, sulphate	Monthly	Standard methods
Hydrostatic pressure cells on base of TMF	Hydrostatic pressure	Monthly	Dip Meter and Automated sensor
TMF	Dynamic pore pressure and liquefaction	Annually	Vibrating wire piezometers
	Standard walkover condition and stability checks	Daily	Visual
TMF embankments wall and crest	Settlement / movement	Quarterly	Survey of fixed movement monitoring stations
	Annual Review	Annually	Approved Standard
	Independent Audit	Every 2 years	Approved Standard

Location	Parameter	Monitoring Frequency	Analysis Method/ Techniques
	Dam Safety Review	Every 10 Years	Approved Standard
TMF and Tailings	Tailings distribution system	Daily	Approved Standard
	TMF surface settlement	Annually	Topographic survey
	Volume of tailings disposed	Continuous	Flow Meter
	Tonnage of tailings disposed	Monthly	Dry Density
	Used capacity	Annually	Approved method
	Remaining capacity	Annually	Approved method
	Tailings geochemistry	As required by the Agency	Approved method
TMF perimeter interceptor channel	Water level	Annually	Automated sensor
	pH, suspended solids, sulphate, temperature, conductivity	Monthly	Standard methods
	Lead, zinc, arsenic, iron, copper, mercury, cobalt, magnesium, manganese, cadmium, nickel, cyanide, aluminium	Quarterly	Standard methods
Area local to TMF	Seismicity	As required by the Agency	Irish National Seismic Network (INSN)
Other			