| Intermediary Group – Kirkgate Youth Theatre Group |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| Question  | Agree  | Response  |
| Overview  |  | <ul> <li>12 young people took part in the consultation.</li> <li>It is important to say that this group was older (mainly between 12-17) and this is reflected in their responses to the topics and also their specific concerns.</li> <li>The session started with a discussion around what a repository was, where it might be sited and what it may look like. The group then discussed geology, safety and the community benefits package.</li> </ul>   |
| 2 – Safety, security,<br>environment and planning | Yes – 8<br>No – 2<br>Not<br>Sure/Partly<br>– 2 | The group had some very specific concerns about the proposed repository and they were as follows • The group were concerned with the safety of underground storage. They talked about possible leaks and how and leakage would be detected? • Would the repository be able to with stand earthquakes? • Would the repository effect on the environment/ local habitats/ wildlife? Where there any guarantees it would not affect the national park? The group felt that if there was additional information available on: • The build quality of the repository storage. • Why the UK needs to store high levels of nuclear waste in the first place? In summary 8 of the group agreed with the partnership and the others who were not sure would probably agree with the partnership if additional information was made available. The group also felt that additional consultation was needed with young people as the decisions would affect them more than the adults making the decision now. |
| 4 – Community benefits                            | Yes – 7<br>No – 0<br>Not Sure/<br>Partly – 5   | Overall the whole group agreed that the community benefits package was a very good thing, but they did<br>have some concerns about how the package is described at this time.<br>The group were concerned that currently there are no clear commitments the group would like some<br>guaranteed figures on jobs for local residents and specific about the amounts within the package. For this<br>reason the group felt that they were very sceptical of the proposed benefits as no real assurances made at<br>this time. The group believes benefits should be agreed by local residents before progressing further into the<br>process.   |