

**Intermediary Group - Solway School Years 9-11**

Group	Question	Agree	Response
Year 9	<b>Overview</b>		34 young people took part in a group discussion facilitated by Connexions.
	<b>2 – Safety, security, environment and planning</b>	Yes – 5 No – 4 25 – Not Sure/ Partly	<p>25 young people were either not sure or only partly agreed with the opinions. 4 disagreed with the views, 5 were in agreement.</p> <p>Those in agreement seemed to pick up on the risks with having the material above ground currently.</p> <p>Those disagreeing were not convinced that the safety case could be made adequately for any site.</p> <p>Those remaining unsure were torn between concerns about the risks balanced against the benefits.</p>
	<b>3 – Impacts</b>	Yes – 5 No – 4 Not Sure/ Partly – 25	<p>25 remained not sure or only partly in agreement. 4 disagreed and 5 agreed with the partnership views.</p> <p>Those disagreeing felt concerns about the impact on the tourism industry were not taken seriously enough and given enough weight: they had real fears about the negative impact this would have. There were also references to environmental damage. Even with the partnership opinions saying these impacts would be investigated and researched further with solutions proffered before development was agreed they remained in disagreement.</p> <p>Those in agreement believed the benefits on offer made progress to the next stage worthwhile to check out the actual impacts and possible solutions. Those unsure could see both views and could not reach a conclusion.</p>
	<b>8 – Overall views on participation</b>		<p>5 young people in the group wanted the process to continue and a site to be researched.</p> <p>4 young people wanted the process to stop now. 25 young people were not sure or only partly agreed.</p> <p>For the 5 in agreement the job benefits and investment in the area were a major attraction: they wanted to look into the risks and impacts further on the basis of this. Those disagreeing felt taking the process a step further meant going a step closer to having the repository and they remained absolutely opposed to this on negative impact and safety grounds. Unfortunately a significant group, partly due to the logistics of the session, were unable to reach a decision on the issues.</p>

<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Overview</b>		44 young people took part in a group discussion facilitated by Connexions.
	<b>2 – Safety, security, environment and planning</b>	Yes – 7 No – 5 Not Sure/ Partly – 32	<p>Logistics in this session were a little difficult. 32 young people were not sure. 7 agreed with the partnership opinions and 5 disagreed. Those in agreement felt that material stored above ground currently needed to be stored more safely quickly. They could see more waste material being produced- "a problem increasing every day" - and that leaving it above ground was a risk on many levels. Those disagreeing had concerns about govt accepting waste from abroad- although they recognised the current commitment to our own waste only they were suspicious that in the long run this would be ignored if there was profit in it- and the major transportation risks this would present. The issue of moving the waste into the area, whatever its source, kept recurring.</p> <p>Perhaps due to the logistics of this session a number of young people were unable to reach a conclusion on the matter.</p>
	<b>3 – Impacts</b>	Yes – 7 No – 5 Not Sure/ Partly – 32	<p>32 young people were not sure or only partly agreed with the findings of the partnership. 5 disagreed and 7 agreed with the findings.</p> <p>For those disagreeing prevalent concerns were the increased traffic pressures they felt the construction and the movement of waste once the plant was operational would bring. "Big increase in traffic on already unsuitable roads". Concerns were also expressed about the the potential use of Silloth, with a port and latent airfield, as an access point for the waste.</p> <p>Conversely, those agreeing felt the prospect of improved infrastructure was a reason to go ahead to the next stage. Similarly they saw a positive impact and benefit in jobs coming to the area both directly and indirectly from such a development. They saw the benefits accruing as positive impacts which made looking for a site worthwhile.</p>
<b>8 – Overall views on participation</b>	Yes – 7 No – 5 Not Sure/ Partly – 32	<p>32 young people could not make a decision on this issue: this may have been a problem with the logistics of the session. 7 agreed that the councils should go ahead and look for a site. 5 disagreed with this idea.</p> <p>Those in agreement felt that there were significant attractions to looking for a site in the West, particularly when there was no commitment to go further than looking at this stage. They appreciated that the next stage could bring some firmer answers to questions than were possible currently.</p> <p>Those disagreeing were frankly suspicious of the current opinions not being very firm or explicit and all "needing to be gone into a bit more". They felt there was scope for confusion and "going back on what has been said".</p>	

<b>Year 11</b>	<b>Overview</b>		31 young people took part in a group discussion facilitated by Connexions.
	<b>2 – Safety, security, environment and planning</b>	Yes – 5 No – 4 Not Sure/ Partly – 23	<p>23 young people remained unsure on this issue. This may have been due to the logistics of the session. 4 disagreed with the partnership views. 5 agreed with the partnership views.</p> <p>Those disagreeing felt the terrorism threat was raised too much and was being used as "a handle to trigger people's fears", essentially to persuade people the waste needed to go underground. They felt if a repository underground was built would the risks around the transportation of the material - whether by road, rail or air - not still remain?</p> <p>Aside from those without a clear view those agreeing with the partnership opinions felt when a site was identified a safety case could be made and this was worth doing in relation to the potential benefits to the area.</p>
	<b>3 – Impacts</b>	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>5 young people agreed with the partnership's opinions, 4 disagreed and 23 remained unsure. Those disagreeing were not convinced by the approach to find a site and then begin to examine how negative impacts could be mitigated. They had strong concerns about potential engineering failures or natural disasters which could cause significant issues in years to come. They also had concerns about traffic issues and the impact on nature and the environment.</p> <p>Those agreeing wanted to go further because they picked up on the messages around retrievability. They asked might the technology improve in the future to retrieve and make the material safe. 1 person asked could the heat from the waste be used as a cheap energy source if technological developments allowed it? For these sort of reasons they felt it was worth looking further into the idea and its possibilities.</p>
<b>8 – Overall views on participation</b>		<p>Views remained consistent through this session. 5 young people felt it was worth progressing to the next stage, 4 did not want to go any further and 23 remained unsure or only partly in agreement.</p> <p>Those looking to go to the next stage and search for a site felt the case had been made to proceed because there was no commitment to accept any site or to progress any building when 1 was found until there was community agreement. They felt the benefits on offer in jobs and infrastructure improvements made this research worthwhile.</p> <p>Those disagreeing held firm to the idea that going to the stage of looking for a site was ignoring a lot of significant risks and impacts which had only been mentioned in the opinions. They were suspicious of progress being made on these matters and being pushed into having the facility.</p>	