

XXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXX XXX

lowradcampaign@gmail.com
01xxx xxxxxx
07887 942043

13th July 2018

Diane McCrea MBE
Ty Cambria / Cambria House
29 Heol Casnewydd / 29 Newport Road
Caerdydd / Cardiff

Dear Ms McCrea

Marine Licence 12/45/ML to dump radioactive marine sediments from Hinkley Point into coastal waters off Cardiff

Kirsty Williams' office has forwarded me your 9th July letter (NRW ref: CH18-100). I am replying to you directly because the issues are urgent, given that the dredging could start at any time. I shall apologise to Kirsty Williams for this discourtesy.

You write that you are required to follow the current assessment procedure developed by the International Atomic Energy Agency. Please can you tell me what that means in the context of the material I sent you that suggests it would be appropriate to require a more precautionary assessment? Dr. Deere-Jones raised the same point¹ but it went unanswered, so I ask now, is NRW subject to some instrument or policy or other consideration that prevents a more thorough investigation?

You describe the evidence I sent you as robust. I agree, so long as you intend the word "robust" as defined by dictionaries and not as a synonym for irrational or hysterical. Please consider whether the evidence is robust enough to trigger the following provisions of Part 1 Introduction Para. 4 of the Environment (Wales) Act 2016, which require you to adhere to principles of sustainable management of natural resources. All the following are relevant:

- (a) to manage adaptively, by ... where appropriate, changing action;
 - (b) to consider the appropriate spatial scale for action;
 - (c) to promote and engage in collaboration and co-operation;
 - (d) to make appropriate arrangements for public participation in decision-making;
 - (e) to take account of all relevant evidence and gather evidence in respect of uncertainties;
 - (f) to take account of the benefits and intrinsic value of natural resources and ecosystems;
 - (g) take account of the short, medium and long term consequences of actions;
- etc.

¹ "... However, the Campaign notes that there is no legal restriction on Welsh Government and NRW to taking or recommending independent action in respect of such issues. While it may be expected that they should not do less than the standard protocols expect, there is no legal restriction on their ability to demand more than the normal protocols expect." (Briefing to Senedd Petitions Committee, March 12, 2018)

The most pertinent are (a) on changing action, (e) on evidence and uncertainties, and (g) on consequences. The evidence of genetic effects after Chernobyl suggests that the consequences for south Wales could be apparent as early as nine months after deposition of the sediment, given the energy of tides across Cardiff Grounds and the well-known mechanisms whereby micron-sized particles become available for inhalation.

I believe I understand your position. Despite not being a scientist in any formal sense, I have been involved in this topic for 25 years including my appointment to the Committee Examining Radiation Risks of Internal Emitters and I know you can't be expected to resolve the scientific discord revealed in my two letters. You can however understand that the to and fro of discussion shows COMARE and Public Health England evading and misrepresenting important issues that are relevant to the dump licence. I have proposed that you resolve your dilemma by suspending the licence pending thorough sampling and full characterisation of the sediment using alpha, not gamma, spectrometry. Assuming that I and my colleagues can scrutinise the sampling, the testing, and the data outputs, this has the capacity to allay much if not all public concern about the mud dump. I see this as a rational and constructive offer and I hope you will respond in the same spirit. I would be happy to meet you if that would be helpful.

Yours sincerely

Richard Bramhall

cc Kirsty Williams AM