

Intermediary Groups - St Benedict's School 6th Form (4 Groups)

Group	Question	Agree	Response
Group 1	Overview		19 young people took part in a group discussion facilitated by Connexions.
	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes – 13 Not Sure/ Partly – 6	13 young people agreed with the initial opinions presented 6 were not sure or only partly agreed. The majority of the group felt the approach sounded good, the multi barrier concept was sound and offered a higher degree of safety. There concerns about the terrorist threat which the burial of waste was generally felt to make less likely. The safety case being developed in the light of a site being identified was felt to be generally acceptable.
	3 – Impacts	Yes – 13 Not Sure/ Partly – 6	13 young people agreed with the initial opinions while 6 were not sure or only partly agreed. While there were some concerns about the degree to which people might be put off visiting the area in the light of a waste depository being built which caused the bulk of the uncertainties there was general agreement that the jobs accompanying the development were very important and valuable to the area. On this basis and with the provisos expressed in the initial opinions the views presented were seen as acceptable by the majority.
	4 – Community benefits	Yes – 12 No – 1 Not Sure/ Partly – 6	12 young people agreed with the initial opinions and 1 young person disagreed while 6 were not sure or only partly agreed. 1 young person was concerned that the opinions did not go very far and were worried about a lack of real commitment in them. Most saw the benefits as something which could be established before any commitment but were clear this would be important.
	8 – Overall views on participation		In this group of 19 6th formers we had had a consistent 6 young people who were not sure or only partly agreed on the 3 other questions we covered. However, as we rounded the discussion up with this question all 19 young people agreed with the proposition that a site should be looked for without any commitment to have it. Although a couple of young people pondered: "Already got Sellafield, if we agree to this, what would come next? Not sure it's such a good idea" However, they still agreed the search should go ahead: they felt this was reasonable to explore more detail on site specific safety, impacts and benefits questions.

Group 2	Overview		20 young people took part in a group discussion facilitated by Connexions.
	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes – 7 No – 6 Not Sure/ Partly – 7	The group of 20 was very closely split on this question. 7 young people agreed with the partnership's initial opinions. 6 disagreed and 7 were not sure or partly agreed. Those disagreeing had concerns about the enormous size of the project and felt the opinions were not strong enough when some risks seem to remain unknown. Concerns that anxieties about safety might be reflected in impacts on tourism. Those agreeing commented on the safety risks inherent in having the waste here currently above ground and feeling the case for its burial underground was a good one on safety grounds and the opinions were therefore acceptable. The Not sure/Partly camp simply felt they were unable to agree or disagree on the info on offer.
	3 – Impacts	Yes – 10 No – 4 Not Sure/ Partly – 6	The group of 20 were more comfortable with these opinions. 10 agreed, 4 disagreed while 6 were not sure or partly agreed. Those in disagreement felt there was not enough made in the opinion of the negative impacts; that a stronger case should be stated of what would be done if effects could not be mitigated. There was in the group though a more positive view of the impact opinion than in "safety". Most felt that the case made to look at the impacts on a site specific basis was sensible and that positive impacts had also to be taken into account and evaluated later in the process.
	4 – Community benefits	Yes – 13 No – 4 Not Sure/ Partly – 3	Much more positive about the opinions in this section than previous 2. From group of 20, 13 agreed with the Partnership views, 4 disagreed and 3 were not sure/partly agreed. Those in agreement saw the community benefits as crucial and thought there was enough commitment here "just need to make sure they happen". They recognised the scope for negotiation before any commitment to accept the repository. The No's felt that any community benefits would not be enough to secure agreement while the Not Sure's thought they could identify some woolliness in references to benefits not meeting local expectations.
	8 – Overall views on participation		The 13 in the group who felt the Community benefits opinion was acceptable also felt it was reasonable to go ahead top look for a site without commitment to pursue it. Their reasoning for this was that the bulk of this waste was already here stored above ground and that as it seemed safer to store it below ground it was reasonable to examine this. "If there is no commitment then there is no harm in looking here. The 4 with a firm "no" view on the issue took an opposing view summarised as: the Sellafield site has been here for some years and will continue here through de-commissioning why should we have to accept more waste coming to the area?

Group 3	Overview		15 young people took part in a group discussion facilitated by Connexions.
	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes – 3 No – 2 Not Sure/ Partly – 10	3 young people agreed with the opinions. 2 did not agree. 10 young people were not sure or only partly agreed. The 3 in agreement felt the opinions were reasonable and were satisfied with the safety considerations to date. For those not in agreement or not sure it was considerations about protection of the environment which caused concern. They did not feel the safety opinions were strong enough, even without an identified site, and wanted to see more commitment to environmental and ecological protection wherever the site might be.
	3 – Impacts	Yes – 11 Not Sure/ Partly – 4	11 young people agreed with these opinions, 4 were not sure or only partly agreed in this group of 15. Generally, tourism impacts exercised the group. The bulk of the group felt as an underground facility, in a county which has had Sellafeld for some years and continued to attract tourists, there would be a minimal impact on nos., of tourists. Most felt that they needed to know the actual site before they could judge tourism impacts. Their feeling was that positive impacts could be maximised by bargaining and negotiating.
	4 – Community benefits	Yes – 6 No – 3 Not Sure/ Partly – 6	Opinions were too closely divided in the group to record an outcome above. 6 agreed with the opinions, 3 disagreed and 6 were not sure or only partly agreed. The Not Sure's and the No's wanted more specifics and felt that even at this stage it should have been possible to secure some commitments and spoke of investment in supporting Higher Education costs and facilities, housing, investment in retail development and lower taxes. The 6 agreeing with the views felt that at this stage with the provisos expressed the views were acceptable but would want to see commitments following quickly on any site identification.
	8 – Overall views on participation		Although views were split on other questions the group were unanimous on this issue in feeling that there was "no harm" in going to the next stage without commitment (15 young people). Potential positive impacts were seen to outweigh the negative: "anything which can go wrong will be weighed up" although they would like more info on how site security will be maintained.

Group 4	Overview		11 young people took part in a group discussion facilitated by Connexions.
	2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Yes – 6 No – 1 Not Sure/ Partly – 4	Responses in the group were very closely split. In a group of 11 6 agreed, 1 did not agree and 4 were not sure or only partly agreed. The group scribe recorded actual comments. "Can't argue with what they are saying until a site has been identified." "Maybe we should wait and see what the findings are from the site in Finland. Do we have info which tells us the other sites already built are really safe?" "Why ask us when it will be our children who have to deal with it." "Isn't Cumbria rock sofeetr, wouldn't it allow leakage of the waste."
	3 – Impacts	Yes – 6 No – 3 Not Sure/ Partly – 2	The responses of the group were closely split. 6 agreed, 3 disagreed and 2 were unsure or only partly agreed. The group scribe recorded actual comments made in the session. "Don't think job opportunities should be used as the only reason to go ahead with the plans" "This development could effect people's views of the Lake District". "Job figures don't sound good enough." "The waste is above ground at Sellafiled now- how is having it underground any different apart from being safer?" There were also concerns expressed about the environment, ecology and landscape.
	4 – Community benefits	Yes – 6 No – 3 Not Sure/ Partly – 2	6 agreed, 3 disagreed and 2 were unsure or only partly agreed: too close a split to record a view above. Some of the group had concerns that there were no real commitments of community benefits in place. Similarly, there were questions about benefits, whatever they might be, outweighing risks. Those in agreement were enthused by the prospect of investment in training and skills development and felt this should start at an early stage to ensure local residents could be in place to secure work.
	8 – Overall views on participation		6 young people agreed, 3 disagreed and 2 were not sure or only partly agreed. "I'd be happy for them to search out a site somewhere as I'd rather it be underground protected by a building and ground rather than on ground level" "It can't do any harm looking around and drilling a few holes" "A search is a step forward and that's worrying." "If it's not built properly and is hundreds of metres down what happens if there is too much pressure? Serious safety concerns."