

**Intermediary Groups - Workington 6th Form Centre (8 Groups)**

Group	Question	Agree	Response
Group 1	<b>Overview</b>		Group of 7 young people.
	<b>2 – Safety, security, environment and planning</b>	No	<p>The whole group of 7 did not agree with the Partnership's initial opinions on safety, security, environment and planning.</p> <p>Their concerns were -                      Experiment in Finland, with a different climate and geology.                      Don't have enough information from Britain.                      There is a risk to nuclear waste, siting 100% of waste in one place is extra dangerous.                      Added risk in getting waste to site.                      Risk of radiation poisoning whilst being transported.</p>
	<b>3 – Impacts</b>	No	<p>The whole group of 7 did not agree with the Partnership's initial opinions on the impacts of a repository in West Cumbria.</p> <p>They felt it would have too many negatives effects on tourism, roads, lifestyle and the effects on population.</p> <p>There would be more traffic pollution from the construction work.</p>
	<b>4 – Community benefits</b>	No	<p>The whole group of 7 did not agree on the Partnership's initial opinions on a community benefits package.</p> <p>The opinions of the group were                      Nothing would compensate for this.                      Nothing would last as long as the impacts.                      Effects on health can't be compensated for.                      No benefits would outweigh the negatives.</p>
	<b>8 – Overall views on participation</b>		<p>All 7 of the group said no to this. They didn't want it to go ahead anywhere in the area.</p> <p>They felt due to safety risks in transport, health and the environment it should not be allowed.</p>

<b>Group 2</b>	<b>Overview</b>		Group of 8 young people.
	<b>2 – Safety, security, environment and planning</b>	Yes	Although all the group agreed, they said they would like more detail and clearer information on the development itself. Such as the cost and the area in which it was to be built.
	<b>3 – Impacts</b>	Yes – 1 No – 2 Not Sure/ Partly – 5	5 said Not Sure, 2 said No and 1 said Yes.  They felt that it would not be worth the initial cost; the employment benefit does not outweigh the disadvantages.  It was also felt that the number of employment opportunities may not be on a large enough scale to outweigh the disadvantages.  Health issues were also seen to be a concern that would impact negatively on peoples' lives.
	<b>4 – Community benefits</b>	Yes – 1 No – 4 Not Sure/ Partly – 3	4 of the group said No, 3 were not sure and 1 said Yes.  The group were unsure how the development will directly impact on and benefit the community, as there seemed no certainty. What type of benefits (specifically) would come from it? it was felt that any advantages should be seen to clearly outweigh the drawbacks.  The group wanted more in-depth detail on the benefits - information so far seems unclear and vague.
	<b>8 – Overall views on participation</b>		The group felt there was no harm in looking for a possible site, because we need more information to be able to make a final decision. Need to be able to look without having the commitment to make a decision. Based on natural, environmental grounds we do not want it. The group was split on this question:4 said Yes, 4 said No.
<b>Group 3</b>	<b>Overview</b>		Group of 15 young people.
	<b>2 – Safety, security, environment and planning</b>	Yes – 10 No – 1 Not Sure/ Partly – 4	10 of the group said Yes, 1 said No and 4 were not sure.  They did feel that storing it underground would be safer than leaving it where it was. They did feel the councils should be encouraged to go and find a site as long as there was still no committment involved.
	<b>3 – Impacts</b>	Yes – 7 Not Sure/	7 agreed and 8 were not sure. Their concerns were:

	Partly – 8	<p>The group wanted to know if the local community would get job priority over other people? It's the local people who are in need of the jobs and getting workers from other areas would only increase the population in the area.</p> <p>They were worried it would destroy the Tourism industry and this would result in more job losses and less money in the area.</p> <p>Health impacts on local people was a concern.</p> <p>However, they did feel that the area already has 70.1% of the waste and tourists still visit. Also - would the new facility attract visitors? (e.g. like Cern does?)</p>
<b>4 – Community benefits</b>	Yes – 7 No – 6 Not Sure/ Partly – 2	<p>The group was split on this issue: 7 said Yes, 6 said No and 2 were not sure.</p> <p>They felt that too many people move to the area now for jobs so could they really afford benefits for everyone?</p> <p>The group felt they needed more details on what benefits would be offered before they would actually agree on a site.</p> <p>They wanted as much research as possible before final plans were made.</p> <p>Also, once a suitable site was identified they wanted more specific and detailed information on the community benefits available.</p>
<b>8 – Overall views on participation</b>		<p>The overall response was Yes (9), 5 said No and 1 was not sure.</p> <p>The main concerns were:  The costs involved in building - can we afford it?  If there is no commitment at this stage then we may as well agree to look.  If a site is found then more investigations should take place to address some of the concerns previously mentioned.'No harm in looking'.  If the council start building and are then bought out by a private company for a profit - could this mean a loss of control and impact on jobs and benefits? How guaranteed will these be?</p>
<b>Group 4</b>	<b>Overview</b>	Group of 17 young people.

<p><b>2 – Safety, security, environment and planning</b></p>	<p>Yes – 6 No – 7 Not Sure/Partly 4</p>	<p>7 said No, 6 said Yes and 4 were not sure.</p> <p>Comments were: Sounds as though it would be safer here than there. However, a high volume is already here so adding to that would attract more attention from terrorists Therefore felt would have to limit it: more pros than cons, e.g. jobs created, but better to store 'our own' (not enough room for more, cheaper). Each facility would have our own - more money and time and less transport costs. Would it cost more to make 1 big facility rather than lots of smaller places? Terrorist attacks - must ensure not able to get in. Fear of complacency - taking over the area and pushing the (local)citizens away. Must ensure strict guidelines are in place (re safety) A feeling that it does stop the county expanding in many ways/areas.</p>
<p><b>3 – Impacts</b></p>	<p>Yes – 7 No – 9 Not Sure/Partly – 1</p>	<p>The group was split: 9 said No, 7 said Yes and 1 was not sure.</p> <p>Reasons for agreeing: Largely to do with increase in jobs Would be all year round work, not seasonal If underground - more control possible Generates income in local economy</p> <p>Reasons for disagreeing: Environmental: would ruin natural resources and 'pros' would not compensate for this Would affect Tourism High level of public spending and what would happen if it fails? What would they spend money on?</p>
<p><b>4 – Community benefits</b></p>	<p>Yes – 7 No – 8 Not Sure/Partly – 2</p>	<p>Another split: 8 said No, 7 said Yes and 2 were not sure.</p> <p>The group were encouraged by the consultation process but felt they need more evidence to help people decide whether it would be good for the majority.</p> <p>Why does it (type of storage)need changed?</p> <p>Group feltneed to know exactly what will happen if things go ahead?</p> <p>More information about the impact on jobs</p>

			'Only good things is jobs?!'
	<b>8 – Overall views on participation</b>		<p>Split response again: 7 No, 8 Yes and 2 not sure.</p> <p>Why does the facility have to be below ground when previously above - why the change?</p> <p>Feel a site should already have been chosen so consultation would have been more relevant</p> <p>Feel they don't know what will happen - lack of definite information/decisions at this stage</p> <p>Feel that Partnership is changing rules to suit themselves and this is wrong</p> <p>Some felt 'not a good idea'</p> <p>What happens when it fails - will it move?</p> <p>We are keeping it (BNF) producing - need to prevent it.</p>
<b>Group 5</b>	<b>Overview</b>		Group of 20 young people.
	<b>2 – Safety, security, environment and planning</b>	<p>Yes – 15  No – 2  Not Sure/  Partly – 3</p>	<p>15 of the group said Yes, 2 said No and 3 were Not sure.</p> <p>Agree because: safety case is sound - go ahead with it.  Less likely to get blown up if underground</p> <p>Disagree because:  If underground will take days to reach it so therefore more risky.  Lot of engineering challenges - accidents more likely to happen?  Risk from terrorists might increase  Transportation of 30% of materials from out of the county - risks involved here</p>
	<b>3 – Impacts</b>	Yes – 20	<p>All of the group (20)said Yes.</p> <p>Reasons why:  Jobs - increase locally, including number of apprenticeships  Property protection - would have to be put in place</p>

		However group were worried about: people from out of the county ('Southerners') getting jobs over local people
<b>4 – Community benefits</b>	Yes – 20	All the group (20) said Yes.  Felt they wanted 'to make our community better than others' but could not give clear examples of what they would like beyond more jobs being available (and reserved for) local people.
<b>8 – Overall views on participation</b>		All the group (20) said Yes. Would like the process to start now to 'save time' (and have more concrete information to base decisions on).  Reasons why: We create the waste so need to get rid of it in some way - should investigate this! Jobs for local people - and some way of making sure this happens  However concerns about impact on local wildlife and nature.
<b>Group 6</b>	<b>Overview</b>	Group of 16 young people.
	<b>2 – Safety, security, environment and planning</b>	Yes – 4 No – 8 Not Sure/ Partly – 4  4 agreed - and feel there is enough knowledge, lots of interest so would be safe. The Government wouldn't want to risk radiation escapes. As science is advancing, it should be safer in 20 years by the time it is complete.  8 disagreed - saying there was a lack of evidence. Has it been done before? How many entrances would there be? What would happen in a radiation escape? How would the ventilation work? There is 1,000 of years to manage safely - who will do this? There are real fears about terrorism. Who would vet the staff and to what degree?  4 not sure - what about transporting waste, what are the risks? How will all country's waste get to the site?
	<b>3 – Impacts</b>	Yes – 16  The whole group of 16 agreed with Partnership's initial opinions but need to know more. There are many questions and further investigations will help answer these. Need guarantee about jobs and training for LOCAL people. Set up a training school to meet this need. Better to have good roads as this benefits the whole community. Prepared to put up with it for end results, if it improves local area for everyone.
	<b>4 – Community benefits</b>	Yes – 10  10 agreed - as this should ensure better schools, hospital improvements and more facilities such as sport

		No – 1 Not Sure/ Partly – 5	centres.  1 disagreed - saying it was bribery! No benefits can compensate for building on the edge of the National Park. It would cause too much disruption to roads etc.  5 not sure - better schools, hospital and facilities are wanted. But need more guarantees about safety before making a decision.
	<b>8 – Overall views on participation</b>		11 - agreed that a search for somewhere to put a repository without commitment to have it would be a good idea.  3 - said no to testing in a National Park as don't have know enough information on what this would involve.  2 - were not sure, again as not enough information available on what this would involve.
<b>Group 7</b>	<b>Overview</b>		Group of 14 young people.
	<b>2 – Safety, security, environment and planning</b>	Yes – 2 No – 3 Not Sure/ Partly – 11	9 out of the group of 14 were not sure on the safety, security, environment and planning, 3 did not agree.  The reasons why were very similar and the main concerns were due to safety - don't have enough information could cause more problems what if it goes wrong 100% of country's waste proves a greater risk bigger target for terroisum bigger blast so more people at risk greater risk of child hood cancers rocks are unstable with a high water content risks in transportation on roads and rail other sites would be better, spread around the country  2 in agreement it is worth going to next stage to check out what safety measures could be put in place.
	<b>3 – Impacts</b>	Yes – 9 No – 3 Not Sure/ Partly – 2	9 agreed with the Partnership's initial opinions as they feel we need more employment in the area for local people. If 70% of population could be affected in a server incident at the moment, it might as well be 100%.

		3 did not agree and 2 were not sure and their opinions were very similar - the effect it could have on tourism the community would be dependant on money from only one employer in the area the "supposed" benefits are bribery
<b>4 – Community benefits</b>	No – 14	Of the group of 14 the whole group said no they didn't agree with the Partnership's initial opinions. The reasons were by offering benefit to deprived areas, more guarantee that they will say yes without thinking of the negatives give things people want, not what the council think we want no guarantee of jobs for local people or better training to meet the needs of the local community no guarantee of better transport or health care need guarantee of free healthcare for illnesses linked to radiation
<b>8 – Overall views on participation</b>		From the group of 14 opinions in this group were very close Yes - 4 No - 6 Not sure - 4  Marginally more young people felt they wouldn't want to go ahead because of concerns about safety and scepticism about the community benefits on offer.  Those agreeing felt it was worth looking at what the benefits might be and how issues would be dealt with when a site was reasonably identified.
<b>Group 8</b>	<b>Overview</b>	Group of 20 young people.
	<b>2 – Safety, security, environment and planning</b>	Yes – 4 No – 11 Not Sure/ Partly – 5  11 did not agree; 4 did agree and 5 were not sure.  Most discussion was around the safety concerns: what would happen if something went wrong? Particularly concerned about storage taking place underground - would it be as safe as above ground storage facilities? The group felt there needed to be more information about the safety procedures that would be put in place.  The group also discussed transportation - how would it be transported?  Would it be safer to have lots of little sites instead of one big one? - General feeling was no; more things



		<p>could go wrong.</p> <p>How would the new site affect the current Sellafield site? - It was generally felt that it would get rid of some of the storage facility at this site.</p>
<b>3 – Impacts</b>	<p>Yes – 16 No – 2 Not Sure/ Partly – 2</p>	<p>16 said Yes; 2 said No and 2 were Not sure.</p> <p>The group felt Tourism would not be affected by a repository as it was not physically big enough to detract from major tourist attractions (e.g. the Lakes).</p> <p>However, it was acknowledged that some visitors could be put off coming to the area because a nuclear facility was in the area.</p> <p>There were concerns that the number of new jobs created by the 'new build' would disappear after the building work was completed and this would not help the local economy long-term.</p> <p>If the facility was not built here - is there a danger that Sellafield would close? The group generally felt this was unlikely to happen, especially as there have already been moves to store the waste elsewhere.</p> <p>The group agreed on the advantages that the Sellafield site brought to West Cumbria: more jobs for local people.</p>
<b>4 – Community benefits</b>	<p>Yes – 1 No – 17 Not Sure/ Partly – 2</p>	<p>17 said No, 1 said Yes and 2 were not sure.</p> <p>The group generally felt there were no concrete guarantee about benefits to the local community yet: Need more details (e.g. an example of what a benefit might be)</p> <p>Employment: the group wanted more commitment to training and jobs for local people. They noted that this had not happened in Finland as not all local people there wanted jobs in the repository. However it was felt that training courses or facilities should be sorted out for local people now so they can take up jobs when the new site gets underway. Were also concerns that the company would rather give the jobs to people who already had experience ( eg Finnish people?)rather than local inexperienced people.</p> <p>Money: when would money come through to the local area? Would there be enough money available from the government?</p>

		Politically: what happens if there is a change of government? Would promises be kept?
<b>8 – Overall views on participation</b>		The majority of the group (18) felt that the Councils should try and look for a suitable underground repository as they could no longer store it underground. 2 were not sure.

<b>Group 2 (Under 15s)</b>	<b>Overview</b>		<p>15 young people took part in the consultation in the Zebras changing room.</p> <p>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.</p>
	<b>1 – Geology</b>	<p>Yes – 6 No – 2 Not Sure/ Partly – 7</p>	<p>The discussion around geology looked what areas of Cumbria could possibly hoist the repository and how that might affect the group. The group felt they were unsure that enough research had been done into the safety of Cumbria ground and if this was done badly this could cause major issues for the future. The group also raised some safety issues which are in the safety section of this from.</p> <p>In summary the group had a mixed response to the partnership views. They felt that to better understand the repository more information would be needed and that the information should be tailored to young people.</p>
	<b>2 – Safety, security, environment and planning</b>	<p>Yes – 9 No – 0 Not Sure/ Partly – 6</p>	<p>The group was fairly split on this section, but no one was opposed to the repository.</p> <p>The group had worries about the health of workers who might be exposed to new forms of radioactive waste. The group were worried about the site being able to be viewed on Google Earth as this might make it easier to attack. The group also thought that the repository being underground would help to make this safer in the longer term.</p> <p>Here again the group thought that if there was more information available they may agree with the partnerships views; again they wanted this to be specific to young people.</p>
	<b>4 – Community benefits</b>	<p>Yes – 15</p>	<p>The group agreed with the partnerships view on the benefits package. They thought that it would be of benefit to them and their local community.</p> <p>The group did want the exact items within the package to be shares as soon as possible, because if the package was not good enough then that would change their minds. They also wanted to be able to influence what was in the package and who would benefit from it.</p>