

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(All Respondents)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	60%	36%	4%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	45%	48%	7%	70%	23%	7%				23%	69%	8%
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	47%	49%	5%	71%	25%	4%				42%	52%	6%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	47%	49%	4%	70%	26%	4%				46%	52%	2%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	45%	50%	5%	68%	28%	4%				41%	57%	2%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	40%	52%	7%	61%	32%	7%				40%	50%	10%
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	58%	36%	6%				16%	76%	8%	63%	29%	8%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	54%	41%	5%				13%	84%	4%	61%	33%	6%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	54%	42%	4%				10%	89%	1%	64%	30%	5%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	57%	38%	5%				16%	81%	3%	67%	27%	7%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	31%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	27%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	43%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(All Respondents)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	54%	40%	6%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	39%	56%	6%	63%	34%	3%				24%	71%	5%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	41%	54%	5%	68%	28%	4%				28%	71%	1%
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	49%	46%	5%	75%	20%	4%				36%	59%	5%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	46%	50%	4%	72%	26%	3%				33%	62%	4%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	43%	53%	4%	68%	29%	3%				31%	66%	3%
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	52%	42%	6%				17%	79%	4%	59%	34%	7%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	58%	37%	5%				23%	71%	6%	66%	29%	5%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	57%	38%	5%				26%	69%	5%	60%	37%	4%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	59%	37%	4%				28%	71%	2%	67%	30%	3%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	29%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	23%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	48%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Biddeford Respondents)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	63%	34%	3%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	45%	48%	6%	68%	24%	8%				19%	77%	4%
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	48%	47%	5%	69%	26%	5%				41%	52%	7%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	48%	49%	3%	69%	28%	3%				38%	62%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	46%	50%	4%	67%	29%	4%				35%	65%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	41%	51%	7%	59%	32%	9%				33%	60%	7%
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	58%	36%	6%				16%	76%	8%	63%	29%	8%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	57%	37%	6%				14%	79%	7%	64%	29%	8%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	58%	39%	3%				12%	86%	2%	68%	26%	6%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	58%	37%	5%				15%	83%	2%	66%	24%	10%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	31%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	24%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	45%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Biddeford Respondents)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	52%	42%	6%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	38%	58%	4%	65%	33%	2%				22%	76%	3%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	41%	54%	5%	68%	28%	4%				28%	71%	1%
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	46%	49%	4%	73%	22%	5%				32%	65%	3%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	43%	54%	3%	68%	29%	3%				28%	70%	1%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	42%	55%	3%	69%	28%	3%				29%	70%	1%
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	48%	44%	8%				16%	80%	4%	54%	32%	13%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	58%	39%	4%				21%	75%	5%	73%	23%	5%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	56%	39%	4%				26%	70%	4%	64%	34%	2%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	58%	39%	4%				25%	73%	1%	71%	27%	2%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	28%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	23%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	49%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Saco Respondents)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	58%	38%	5%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	44%	48%	8%	72%	22%	7%				28%	59%	12%
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	45%	50%	5%	72%	24%	4%				43%	53%	4%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	46%	49%	5%	71%	25%	4%				56%	40%	4%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	44%	50%	6%	70%	27%	4%				48%	48%	4%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	40%	53%	7%	62%	32%	6%				49%	38%	13%
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)												
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	50%	45%	5%				11%	88%	1%	59%	37%	4%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	51%	45%	4%				9%	90%	1%	60%	35%	5%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	56%	39%	4%				17%	80%	3%	67%	29%	3%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	30%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	30%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	40%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Saco Respondents)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	57%	38%	5%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	39%	53%	7%	62%	34%	4%				27%	66%	8%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)												
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	51%	43%	6%	77%	19%	4%				40%	51%	8%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	50%	46%	5%	75%	23%	2%				39%	53%	8%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	44%	51%	5%	68%	29%	3%				34%	61%	5%
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	55%	41%	4%				17%	78%	4%	63%	36%	1%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	58%	35%	7%				26%	66%	8%	59%	35%	6%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	57%	37%	6%				27%	68%	6%	56%	39%	5%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	61%	36%	4%				30%	68%	2%	64%	33%	3%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	31%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	22%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	47%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Living Between 0 and 1 Miles from MERC)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	61%	35%	5%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	45%	47%	8%	70%	21%	8%				13%	79%	8%
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	47%	48%	6%	69%	25%	6%				43%	53%	4%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	49%	46%	6%	70%	25%	5%				52%	44%	4%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	47%	48%	6%	69%	27%	4%				42%	54%	4%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	41%	50%	9%	58%	34%	9%				46%	38%	16%
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	61%	34%	5%				20%	76%	4%	68%	24%	8%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	58%	37%	5%				18%	79%	3%	67%	27%	6%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	58%	37%	5%				13%	85%	2%	72%	22%	6%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	59%	35%	6%				20%	77%	2%	67%	23%	10%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	30%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	24%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	46%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Living Between 0 and 1 Miles from MERC)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	56%	38%	7%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	35%	59%	6%	56%	39%	5%				19%	76%	5%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	38%	57%	6%	62%	31%	7%				25%	73%	2%
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	45%	49%	6%	69%	24%	7%				28%	68%	3%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	41%	56%	4%	62%	34%	4%				24%	75%	1%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	41%	53%	5%	64%	31%	5%				29%	69%	3%
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	50%	43%	8%				18%	76%	6%	54%	36%	10%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	57%	37%	6%				20%	70%	10%	68%	27%	5%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	57%	38%	5%				27%	69%	4%	63%	33%	4%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	59%	36%	5%				31%	68%	2%	68%	28%	4%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	25%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	19%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	56%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Living Between 1 and 2 Miles from MERC)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	57%	40%	3%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	41%	51%	8%	67%	24%	8%				30%	55%	15%
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	44%	53%	3%	70%	27%	3%				44%	56%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	44%	53%	3%	71%	28%	2%				51%	49%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	44%	53%	3%	72%	26%	2%				44%	56%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	41%	54%	5%	66%	29%	5%				42%	49%	8%
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	52%	41%	7%				7%	79%	14%	54%	42%	4%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	49%	46%	5%				8%	87%	5%	57%	37%	6%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	50%	47%	3%				7%	92%	1%	60%	36%	4%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	54%	41%	5%				10%	84%	6%	69%	26%	4%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	30%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	33%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	37%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Living Between 1 and 2 Miles from MERC)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	55%	41%	3%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	44%	51%	5%	70%	27%	3%				26%	67%	7%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	48%	50%	3%	76%	22%	1%				30%	70%	
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	54%	42%	4%	83%	15%	2%				39%	53%	9%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	53%	43%	4%	80%	19%	1%				43%	46%	11%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	47%	50%	3%	75%	24%	2%				30%	67%	3%
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	56%	41%	3%				14%	84%	2%	72%	26%	2%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	62%	34%	3%				23%	73%	5%	77%	19%	4%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	60%	35%	4%				26%	70%	4%	65%	29%	5%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	62%	36%	2%				26%	73%	1%	71%	26%	3%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	33%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	26%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	41%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Living Over 2 Miles from MERC)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	63%	33%	5%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	48%	47%	5%	71%	24%	5%				36%	64%	
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	48%	46%	6%	73%	23%	4%				31%	52%	18%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	47%	49%	4%	70%	26%	4%				31%	69%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	44%	51%	5%	65%	30%	5%				36%	64%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	39%	55%	6%	59%	34%	7%				27%	73%	
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	53%	39%	8%				16%	74%	10%	54%	35%	11%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	52%	42%	7%				10%	86%	4%	53%	40%	7%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	53%	44%	3%				10%	90%		56%	40%	4%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	57%	40%	3%				15%	85%		62%	32%	6%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	32%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	26%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	42%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Living Over 2 Miles from MERC)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	52%	42%	6%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	38%	57%	5%	63%	36%	1%				27%	70%	4%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	38%	55%	7%	72%	28%					21%	79%	
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	49%	46%	5%	75%	21%	3%				43%	50%	6%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	48%	48%	4%	76%	22%	2%				37%	59%	4%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	41%	56%	4%	66%	31%	2%				35%	62%	4%
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	50%	43%	7%				17%	80%	3%	55%	39%	6%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	55%	40%	5%				26%	70%	4%	49%	45%	6%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	52%	42%	6%				25%	70%	5%	45%	53%	2%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	55%	41%	4%				23%	74%	3%	58%	42%	

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	30%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	25%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	45%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Female Respondents)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	61%	34%	5%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	44%	47%	9%	67%	25%	8%				25%	63%	13%
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	44%	49%	7%	63%	31%	6%				54%	43%	3%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	47%	47%	6%	67%	29%	4%				56%	40%	3%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	43%	50%	7%	63%	32%	5%				46%	51%	3%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	36%	53%	11%	52%	38%	10%				44%	39%	17%
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	56%	39%	5%				24%	74%	2%	62%	31%	7%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	54%	40%	6%				18%	80%	2%	61%	34%	4%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	55%	39%	6%				14%	84%	2%	64%	29%	7%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	58%	35%	7%				21%	76%	3%	67%	24%	8%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	26%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	24%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	50%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Female Respondents)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	56%	37%	7%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	37%	55%	7%	57%	39%	4%				26%	68%	7%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	42%	52%	6%	61%	33%	5%				35%	62%	2%
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	48%	46%	7%	71%	24%	5%				39%	56%	5%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	43%	52%	6%	64%	32%	4%				35%	63%	2%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	41%	53%	6%	62%	33%	5%				31%	66%	3%
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	51%	41%	8%				18%	78%	4%	58%	34%	9%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	59%	36%	6%				28%	66%	6%	63%	32%	5%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	58%	36%	6%				31%	63%	6%	60%	37%	3%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	59%	36%	5%				30%	68%	2%	66%	30%	4%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	26%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	20%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	55%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Male Respondents)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	59%	38%	3%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	46%	50%	4%	73%	21%	7%				21%	79%	
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	49%	48%	3%	79%	18%	3%				24%	66%	10%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	47%	51%	2%	74%	23%	4%				31%	69%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	48%	50%	2%	75%	22%	2%				34%	66%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	45%	52%	3%	70%	26%	4%				35%	65%	
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	60%	33%	8%				5%	78%	17%	65%	27%	8%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	53%	42%	4%				6%	88%	6%	61%	30%	9%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	54%	45%	1%				6%	93%	1%	65%	32%	3%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	56%	42%	2%				11%	87%	2%	65%	31%	4%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	36%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	30%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	34%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Male Respondents)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	52%	44%	4%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	40%	56%	4%	70%	28%	2%				22%	75%	4%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	40%	57%	4%	79%	19%	2%				21%	79%	
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	50%	47%	3%	81%	16%	3%				32%	62%	6%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	50%	48%	2%	81%	18%	1%				31%	62%	7%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	45%	53%	2%	76%	23%	1%				31%	66%	3%
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	53%	44%	4%				15%	81%	4%	61%	35%	4%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	57%	38%	5%				18%	76%	7%	71%	24%	6%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	56%	41%	4%				21%	75%	4%	59%	36%	5%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	59%	39%	1%				25%	74%	1%	69%	31%	

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	33%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	26%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	41%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Age 18 to 34)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	72%	26%	2%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	51%	42%	7%	68%	26%	6%				23%	70%	7%
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	58%	36%	6%	73%	22%	5%				58%	28%	14%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	57%	38%	5%	72%	23%	4%				58%	42%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	54%	41%	5%	70%	26%	5%				44%	56%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	47%	45%	8%	60%	33%	7%				44%	42%	14%
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	73%	19%	7%				34%	47%	19%	68%	23%	9%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	65%	28%	7%				19%	70%	11%	67%	27%	5%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	64%	32%	4%				14%	86%		67%	28%	5%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	67%	27%	6%				14%	81%	4%	75%	17%	8%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	36%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	18%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	46%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Age 18 to 34)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	49%	44%	7%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	32%	63%	5%	58%	41%	1%				19%	78%	3%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	32%	65%	3%	56%	44%					31%	69%	
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	40%	58%	3%	66%	32%	2%				25%	75%	
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	36%	63%	2%	58%	40%	1%				25%	75%	
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	32%	66%	3%	57%	40%	3%				21%	79%	
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	43%	49%	8%				17%	79%	3%	45%	45%	9%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	50%	45%	5%				19%	75%	6%	59%	41%	
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	49%	47%	4%				29%	70%	1%	40%	58%	2%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	47%	48%	5%				22%	78%		50%	48%	2%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	23%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	25%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	51%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Age 35 to 49)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	58%	37%	5%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	48%	45%	7%	78%	15%	7%				26%	63%	12%
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	47%	48%	5%	76%	21%	4%				32%	61%	6%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	48%	48%	4%	76%	21%	2%				37%	56%	6%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	44%	50%	6%	71%	24%	5%				26%	68%	6%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	42%	50%	8%	66%	27%	7%				43%	44%	13%
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	56%	39%	5%				17%	77%	6%	63%	30%	7%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	52%	43%	6%				12%	86%	2%	55%	35%	10%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	55%	43%	3%				10%	88%	2%	66%	31%	4%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	57%	40%	3%				16%	80%	3%	65%	31%	4%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	34%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	28%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	39%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Age 35 to 49)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	55%	39%	5%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	44%	52%	5%	73%	25%	2%				22%	72%	7%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	52%	46%	2%	89%	11%					12%	88%	
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	51%	44%	5%	85%	11%	4%				25%	72%	3%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	51%	44%	5%	86%	13%	2%				22%	67%	11%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	48%	50%	3%	77%	22%	1%				31%	65%	3%
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	56%	39%	5%				10%	85%	5%	75%	22%	2%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	62%	35%	3%				18%	77%	5%	76%	21%	3%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	59%	37%	4%				16%	78%	7%	73%	27%	
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	62%	35%	3%				23%	74%	2%	73%	27%	

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	36%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	25%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	39%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Age 50 to 64)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	53%	43%	3%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	37%	58%	6%	64%	29%	8%				28%	72%	
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	38%	59%	3%	64%	32%	4%				39%	61%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	38%	58%	4%	61%	34%	5%				53%	47%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	40%	58%	3%	63%	34%	3%				62%	38%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	36%	61%	3%	58%	37%	4%				46%	54%	
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	50%	46%	4%				10%	86%	4%	68%	29%	3%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	45%	53%	2%				11%	89%		54%	45%	2%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	46%	53%	1%				10%	90%		59%	41%	
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	47%	48%	4%				18%	81%	1%	50%	43%	7%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	25%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	34%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	42%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Age 50 to 64)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	59%	37%	4%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	45%	48%	7%	67%	27%	6%				28%	66%	6%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	45%	48%	7%	65%	28%	8%				48%	47%	5%
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	60%	35%	5%	83%	13%	4%				51%	40%	9%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	53%	43%	4%	72%	24%	4%				48%	50%	3%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	51%	43%	6%	73%	22%	5%				38%	57%	5%
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	60%	36%	4%				25%	69%	6%	66%	32%	3%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	65%	30%	5%				31%	62%	8%	76%	21%	4%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	62%	31%	7%				31%	62%	7%	66%	27%	7%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	67%	31%	2%				33%	66%	2%	78%	20%	3%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	32%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	18%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	50%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Age 65 or Older)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	54%	40%	6%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	40%	52%	8%	66%	25%	9%				13%	73%	13%
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	37%	58%	6%	62%	32%	6%				27%	73%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	39%	56%	5%	63%	34%	3%				35%	65%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	40%	55%	5%	67%	32%	2%				35%	65%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	33%	58%	9%	55%	34%	11%				22%	65%	13%
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	38%	53%	9%				4%	92%	4%	47%	39%	14%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	50%	45%	5%				9%	87%	4%	67%	30%	3%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	48%	42%	9%				7%	89%	4%	64%	20%	16%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	54%	40%	6%				13%	85%	2%	72%	19%	9%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	23%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	32%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	45%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Age 65 or Older)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	56%	39%	6%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	33%	60%	7%	48%	47%	5%				27%	68%	5%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	38%	52%	11%	62%	24%	14%				16%	84%	
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	45%	46%	9%	62%	29%	8%				45%	43%	12%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	47%	48%	5%	67%	28%	5%				40%	54%	5%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	45%	48%	7%	64%	29%	7%				36%	58%	5%
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	49%	45%	6%				15%	82%	3%	50%	36%	14%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	55%	35%	10%				29%	62%	9%	51%	30%	19%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	58%	35%	6%				33%	62%	5%	61%	32%	7%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	65%	31%	5%				40%	55%	5%	70%	24%	6%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	23%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	19%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	58%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents who Own Residence)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	57%	39%	4%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	44%	50%	6%	71%	22%	7%				28%	66%	6%
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	44%	52%	4%	71%	26%	3%				40%	53%	7%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	45%	52%	3%	71%	26%	2%				44%	56%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	43%	54%	3%	69%	29%	2%				40%	60%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	38%	55%	6%	61%	32%	6%				35%	55%	10%
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	51%	43%	6%				11%	82%	7%	58%	36%	6%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	50%	45%	5%				10%	88%	3%	58%	38%	4%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	50%	47%	3%				8%	90%	1%	58%	37%	4%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	53%	42%	4%				15%	82%	3%	60%	34%	6%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	30%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	31%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	39%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents who Own Residence)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	55%	39%	6%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	42%	52%	6%	68%	29%	3%				25%	69%	7%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	46%	49%	5%	74%	24%	2%				27%	71%	2%
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	53%	42%	5%	81%	15%	4%				39%	55%	6%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	52%	43%	4%	80%	18%	2%				39%	55%	6%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	46%	50%	4%	72%	26%	2%				32%	64%	4%
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	57%	38%	5%				19%	78%	3%	68%	28%	4%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	62%	34%	4%				25%	71%	4%	70%	25%	5%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	60%	35%	5%				28%	68%	5%	64%	34%	3%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	62%	34%	4%				30%	68%	2%	67%	31%	2%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	32%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	22%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	45%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents who Rent Residence)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	66%	29%	5%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	47%	44%	9%	67%	24%	9%				16%	73%	11%
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	51%	42%	7%	69%	24%	7%				48%	46%	6%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	50%	43%	7%	67%	27%	6%				53%	41%	6%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	50%	43%	8%	67%	26%	7%				45%	49%	6%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	44%	46%	10%	58%	32%	9%				53%	36%	11%
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	67%	27%	6%				23%	68%	9%	70%	20%	9%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	61%	33%	6%				19%	74%	7%	66%	26%	8%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	63%	33%	5%				14%	85%	2%	74%	19%	7%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	64%	30%	5%				17%	81%	1%	76%	15%	9%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	31%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	19%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	50%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents who Rent Residence)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	53%	41%	6%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	32%	63%	5%	52%	44%	4%				21%	77%	2%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	35%	61%	5%	59%	34%	7%				28%	72%	
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	40%	55%	5%	63%	31%	6%				29%	67%	4%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	34%	63%	3%	54%	42%	4%				21%	78%	2%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	38%	58%	4%	61%	34%	5%				29%	69%	2%
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	43%	50%	7%				12%	81%	7%	45%	43%	12%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	51%	42%	8%				20%	70%	10%	59%	35%	6%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	50%	45%	5%				23%	72%	5%	52%	42%	5%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	54%	43%	3%				24%	75%	1%	67%	30%	3%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	22%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	23%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	55%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents with Household Incomes Less than \$20,000)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	71%	23%	6%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	47%	37%	16%	60%	22%	17%				17%	63%	21%
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	43%	47%	10%	55%	36%	9%				30%	49%	21%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	40%	49%	11%	53%	39%	9%				17%	63%	21%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	44%	44%	11%	58%	32%	9%				30%	49%	21%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	31%	54%	15%	41%	44%	16%				17%	63%	21%
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	57%	35%	8%				21%	79%		59%	30%	11%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	62%	30%	7%				23%	72%	4%	68%	22%	10%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	60%	28%	12%				8%	81%	11%	69%	18%	14%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	61%	30%	9%				11%	89%		70%	18%	12%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	17%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	17%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	66%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents with Household Incomes Less than \$20,000)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	51%	40%	9%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	24%	67%	10%	42%	49%	9%				10%	90%	
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	22%	70%	9%	34%	54%	12%				25%	75%	
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	35%	55%	10%	48%	39%	13%				36%	64%	
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	30%	63%	7%	44%	47%	9%				19%	81%	
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	35%	60%	6%	53%	38%	9%				31%	69%	
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	39%	53%	8%				19%	77%	3%	46%	42%	12%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	56%	37%	7%				31%	66%	3%	67%	26%	7%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	48%	47%	5%				29%	69%	3%	51%	44%	5%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	60%	33%	6%				40%	60%		78%	16%	6%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	12%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	18%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	70%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents with Household Incomes Between \$20,000 and \$40,000)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	66%	31%	3%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	49%	45%	6%	69%	24%	7%				49%	51%	
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	50%	46%	4%	72%	25%	3%				49%	51%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	51%	44%	4%	71%	25%	4%				66%	34%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	49%	47%	3%	68%	30%	3%				72%	28%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	46%	47%	7%	62%	29%	8%				72%	28%	
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	57%	39%	4%				8%	85%	7%	58%	34%	7%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	55%	43%	2%				11%	89%		53%	45%	1%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	58%	40%	3%				12%	88%		59%	37%	4%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	61%	36%	3%				16%	84%		66%	30%	4%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	35%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	25%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	39%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents with Household Incomes Between \$20,000 and \$40,000)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	53%	42%	5%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	34%	62%	4%	57%	43%					22%	71%	7%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	41%	53%	6%	69%	25%	5%				30%	64%	5%
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	42%	55%	3%	69%	29%	2%				28%	72%	
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	40%	58%	2%	67%	32%	1%				28%	72%	
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	39%	58%	3%	65%	34%	2%				28%	69%	3%
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	44%	50%	6%				11%	85%	4%	44%	49%	7%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	47%	46%	7%				15%	75%	11%	51%	49%	
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	47%	48%	5%				18%	78%	4%	47%	51%	2%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	49%	48%	2%				19%	81%		51%	49%	

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	26%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	29%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	45%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents with Household Incomes Between \$40,000 and \$60,000)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	59%	37%	4%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	46%	49%	6%	73%	19%	8%				20%	80%	
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	47%	49%	4%	75%	20%	5%				31%	69%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	49%	47%	4%	76%	19%	5%				38%	62%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	49%	46%	5%	78%	17%	5%				31%	69%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	46%	48%	6%	70%	23%	7%				37%	63%	
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	57%	33%	10%				18%	70%	13%	63%	26%	11%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	54%	40%	6%				11%	82%	7%	63%	27%	10%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	56%	41%	3%				12%	86%	2%	69%	24%	6%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	59%	36%	5%				18%	75%	7%	70%	24%	5%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	35%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	26%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	39%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents with Household Incomes Between \$40,000 and \$60,000)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	50%	44%	6%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	41%	56%	3%	69%	29%	1%				30%	66%	4%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	43%	55%	1%	73%	27%					30%	70%	
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	50%	47%	3%	82%	15%	3%				40%	55%	5%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	49%	50%	1%	79%	20%	1%				44%	56%	
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	44%	52%	4%	72%	23%	5%				38%	62%	
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	54%	41%	5%				16%	80%	4%	73%	23%	4%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	57%	39%	4%				24%	73%	4%	69%	22%	9%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	61%	35%	4%				31%	67%	1%	78%	18%	4%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	60%	37%	4%				29%	69%	1%	73%	23%	4%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	33%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	23%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	44%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents with Household Incomes Between \$60,000 and \$80,000)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	60%	36%	4%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	42%	51%	7%	68%	26%	6%				34%	66%	
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	44%	52%	4%	70%	30%					61%	39%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	37%	59%	4%	59%	41%					61%	39%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	34%	60%	6%	53%	43%	4%				61%	39%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	35%	58%	7%	55%	42%	4%				61%		39%
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	44%	56%						100%		40%	60%	
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	46%	48%	6%				6%	94%		48%	45%	7%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	47%	51%	2%				3%	97%		49%	51%	
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	51%	44%	5%				6%	90%	4%	60%	36%	4%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	29%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	33%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	38%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents with Household Incomes Between \$60,000 and \$80,000)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	59%	36%	5%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	49%	46%	6%	76%	20%	4%				27%	73%	
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	53%	44%	3%	76%	24%					46%	54%	
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	58%	39%	4%	83%	15%	2%				51%	49%	
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	57%	38%	5%	84%	16%					42%	39%	19%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	51%	45%	4%	76%	23%	1%				42%	58%	
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	60%	38%	2%				18%	82%		69%	31%	
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	64%	33%	3%				27%	71%	3%	65%	30%	5%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	63%	32%	6%				24%	68%	7%	64%	27%	9%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	66%	31%	2%				36%	64%		68%	32%	

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	38%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	22%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	40%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents with Household Incomes Over \$80,000)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	53%	45%	3%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	47%	52%	2%	84%	13%	3%				12%	88%	
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	48%	48%	5%	83%	15%	3%				28%	56%	16%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	53%	47%		89%	11%					33%	67%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	48%	51%	1%	87%	13%					17%	83%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	48%	51%	1%	82%	16%	2%				33%	67%	
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	64%	31%	6%				26%	63%	11%	80%	20%	
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	52%	42%	6%				14%	81%	5%	64%	28%	8%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	52%	48%					7%	93%		72%	28%	
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	57%	41%	2%				15%	82%	3%	79%	21%	

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	35%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	30%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	35%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents with Household Incomes Over \$80,000)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	57%	38%	5%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	45%	49%	6%	73%	22%	5%				16%	78%	7%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	48%	46%	6%	81%	16%	2%				19%	81%	
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	56%	41%	3%	87%	12%	1%				21%	62%	18%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	52%	45%	4%	81%	16%	3%				16%	73%	12%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	48%	50%	2%	78%	20%	1%				16%	72%	12%
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	61%	35%	4%				13%	83%	4%	87%	13%	
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	64%	33%	3%				15%	78%	7%	85%	15%	
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	60%	37%	3%				15%	78%	7%	74%	26%	
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	62%	36%	2%				11%	84%	5%	79%	21%	

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	36%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	24%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	41%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents with a High School Education or Less)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	62%	32%	7%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	44%	47%	9%	66%	26%	8%				28%	67%	5%
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	43%	52%	6%	63%	32%	4%				43%	57%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	45%	48%	6%	67%	29%	4%				43%	57%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	44%	48%	7%	66%	30%	4%				46%	54%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	35%	54%	11%	51%	38%	11%				40%	53%	7%
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	61%	30%	9%				20%	75%	5%	66%	17%	17%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	56%	36%	8%				17%	79%	4%	64%	28%	9%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	55%	38%	7%				13%	86%	1%	63%	27%	10%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	57%	36%	7%				17%	83%		64%	24%	12%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	29%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	24%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	47%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents with a High School Education or Less)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	52%	42%	6%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	31%	63%	6%	53%	43%	4%				18%	77%	5%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	29%	64%	7%	53%	38%	8%				21%	77%	3%
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	41%	52%	7%	65%	29%	6%				32%	61%	7%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	37%	57%	5%	59%	36%	5%				28%	69%	2%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	36%	57%	7%	58%	35%	8%				30%	66%	4%
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	46%	46%	8%				20%	73%	7%	49%	42%	9%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	55%	39%	6%				25%	69%	6%	64%	29%	7%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	52%	42%	6%				27%	68%	6%	56%	40%	4%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	53%	41%	5%				30%	68%	2%	59%	35%	6%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	22%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	23%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	54%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents with a Some College Education)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	58%	40%	1%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	46%	46%	7%	77%	14%	9%				16%	63%	21%
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	49%	46%	5%	76%	17%	7%				48%	45%	7%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	46%	51%	3%	69%	26%	4%				60%	33%	7%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	44%	52%	4%	69%	25%	6%				39%	54%	7%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	40%	54%	5%	63%	32%	5%				42%	38%	21%
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	58%	36%	5%				16%	71%	13%	63%	37%	
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	52%	44%	4%				15%	82%	3%	54%	39%	7%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	52%	45%	2%				10%	88%	3%	63%	32%	4%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	54%	43%	3%				12%	84%	3%	65%	30%	5%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	32%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	31%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	37%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents with a Some College Education)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	58%	37%	6%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	42%	54%	5%	64%	32%	4%				32%	68%	
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	47%	51%	3%	75%	21%	4%				29%	71%	
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	53%	44%	3%	78%	18%	4%				47%	53%	
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	50%	47%	3%	75%	23%	3%				42%	52%	6%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	49%	49%	2%	76%	24%	1%				37%	63%	
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	57%	38%	5%				17%	80%	3%	67%	26%	7%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	61%	37%	2%				20%	76%	4%	73%	23%	4%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	58%	38%	5%				20%	75%	5%	65%	32%	3%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	65%	33%	2%				27%	73%		81%	19%	

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	30%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	22%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	48%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents with a College Education or Greater)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	62%	36%	2%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	46%	49%	5%	68%	26%	6%				25%	75%	
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	49%	46%	4%	74%	23%	2%				33%	57%	10%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	50%	47%	3%	74%	23%	3%				40%	60%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	48%	49%	3%	71%	27%	2%				40%	60%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	47%	48%	5%	69%	26%	5%				40%	55%	5%
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	53%	43%	4%				12%	80%	8%	60%	37%	3%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	54%	42%	4%				8%	88%	4%	64%	33%	2%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	56%	42%	2%				9%	91%		67%	31%	2%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	60%	36%	4%				17%	78%	5%	71%	26%	3%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	32%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	26%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	41%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents with a College Education or Greater)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	54%	40%	5%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	43%	51%	7%	71%	28%	1%				21%	70%	9%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	52%	44%	4%	78%	22%					34%	66%	
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	52%	43%	5%	82%	15%	3%				30%	63%	8%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	50%	46%	3%	80%	19%	1%				30%	64%	6%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	45%	52%	3%	72%	27%	1%				29%	67%	4%
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	53%	42%	4%				12%	87%	1%	63%	32%	5%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	58%	35%	7%				22%	70%	8%	60%	35%	5%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	59%	36%	4%				28%	68%	4%	60%	37%	3%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	60%	37%	3%				24%	73%	3%	65%	35%	

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	34%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	23%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	43%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Who Have Lived in the Area for Less than 5 Years)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	70%	27%	2%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	47%	40%	13%	66%	21%	13%					82%	18%
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	59%	32%	8%	78%	14%	8%				48%	43%	9%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	55%	38%	7%	69%	24%	7%				62%	29%	9%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	50%	43%	8%	65%	27%	7%				43%	48%	9%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	45%	43%	12%	57%	31%	12%				53%	19%	28%
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	64%	31%	5%				29%	71%		62%	27%	12%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	64%	32%	4%				20%	80%		67%	26%	7%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	62%	31%	7%				11%	86%	3%	68%	21%	11%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	66%	28%	6%				19%	74%	7%	74%	20%	7%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	33%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	19%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	48%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Who Have Lived in the Area for Less than 5 Years)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	51%	41%	8%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	29%	64%	7%	52%	47%	1%				10%	83%	7%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	44%	54%	2%	69%	31%					28%	72%	
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	42%	53%	5%	67%	28%	5%				26%	74%	
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	37%	60%	2%	62%	38%					21%	79%	
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	35%	61%	4%	59%	37%	4%				21%	79%	
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	42%	51%	7%				8%	88%	4%	53%	41%	6%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	50%	41%	9%				14%	74%	11%	61%	33%	6%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	51%	43%	6%				22%	73%	5%	56%	41%	4%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	49%	46%	5%				21%	78%	1%	57%	43%	

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	22%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	24%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	55%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Who Have Lived in the Area for 6 to 10 Years)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	52%	47%	1%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	39%	56%	4%	72%	24%	4%				25%	58%	17%
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	42%	57%	1%	75%	25%					42%	58%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	41%	55%	4%	71%	24%	5%				58%	42%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	40%	57%	3%	71%	25%	4%				42%	58%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	37%	58%	5%	65%	30%	6%				41%	42%	17%
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	55%	43%	2%				9%	85%	5%	72%	28%	
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	52%	47%	1%				13%	87%		73%	27%	
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	50%	49%	1%				9%	91%		73%	27%	
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	52%	44%	4%				12%	86%	2%	75%	17%	8%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	28%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	39%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	32%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Who Have Lived in the Area for 6 to 10 Years)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	59%	36%	5%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	49%	48%	3%	77%	22%	1%				26%	74%	
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	39%	53%	7%	65%	24%	10%				31%	69%	
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	54%	42%	4%	83%	13%	4%				32%	63%	6%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	48%	49%	3%	74%	26%					27%	64%	9%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	52%	48%	1%	77%	21%	1%				38%	62%	
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	56%	37%	8%				15%	76%	9%	43%	40%	17%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	60%	37%	3%				20%	77%	2%	60%	40%	
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	56%	40%	4%				22%	72%	7%	43%	57%	
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	68%	30%	2%				33%	64%	2%	72%	28%	

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	38%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	20%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	42%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Who Have Lived in the Area for 11 to 20 Years)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	59%	36%	5%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	48%	47%	6%	73%	23%	4%				31%	62%	7%
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	48%	46%	6%	73%	24%	3%				45%	38%	17%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	50%	46%	4%	75%	24%	1%				43%	57%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	49%	46%	5%	76%	22%	1%				42%	58%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	43%	52%	5%	64%	32%	4%				50%	41%	9%
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	59%	29%	12%				12%	65%	23%	59%	20%	21%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	53%	38%	9%				13%	80%	8%	55%	33%	12%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	52%	44%	3%				13%	87%		52%	45%	3%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	57%	40%	3%				18%	82%		62%	35%	3%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	33%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	25%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	42%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Who Have Lived in the Area for 11 to 20 Years)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	58%	36%	7%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	39%	53%	9%	59%	36%	6%				36%	58%	6%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	38%	52%	10%	66%	27%	7%				18%	82%	
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	49%	43%	7%	73%	21%	5%				40%	49%	11%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	47%	46%	6%	70%	26%	4%				40%	54%	6%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	39%	57%	5%	61%	37%	2%				26%	68%	6%
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	50%	41%	9%				12%	86%	2%	62%	31%	7%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	56%	39%	5%				21%	73%	6%	58%	35%	7%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	55%	39%	6%				27%	69%	4%	51%	44%	5%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	55%	40%	5%				15%	83%	2%	65%	33%	3%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	26%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	23%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	51%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Who Have Lived in the Area for 21 to 30 Years)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	65%	32%	3%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	48%	50%	2%	72%	27%	2%				16%	84%	
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	43%	55%	2%	64%	34%	1%				16%	84%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	46%	52%	2%	69%	30%	1%				16%	84%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	44%	54%	1%	66%	34%					16%	84%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	41%	53%	6%	60%	32%	8%				16%	84%	
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	56%	37%	6%				12%	73%	14%	55%	45%	
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	54%	40%	6%				7%	81%	12%	53%	47%	
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	54%	45%	1%				7%	93%		48%	47%	4%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	58%	38%	4%				10%	86%	4%	59%	32%	9%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	37%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	24%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	40%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Who Have Lived in the Area for 21 to 30 Years)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	51%	43%	5%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	43%	55%	2%	74%	26%					25%	67%	8%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	52%	48%		82%	18%					39%	61%	
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	54%	46%		88%	12%					43%	57%	
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	53%	46%	1%	86%	12%	2%				37%	63%	
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	46%	53%	1%	81%	19%					22%	78%	
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	61%	38%	1%				24%	73%	3%	79%	21%	
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	63%	35%	2%				27%	70%	3%	78%	15%	7%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	61%	38%	1%				25%	75%		85%	15%	
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	64%	35%	1%				28%	72%		95%	5%	

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	36%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	27%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	37%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Who Have Lived in the Area for Over 30 Years)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	56%	38%	6%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	43%	50%	7%	69%	22%	9%				35%	65%	
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	40%	55%	5%	64%	31%	6%				46%	54%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	43%	54%	4%	68%	29%	3%				45%	55%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	42%	53%	5%	65%	30%	4%				48%	52%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	37%	57%	6%	59%	35%	6%				33%	67%	
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	55%	40%	5%				15%	83%	2%	67%	26%	6%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	49%	47%	4%				11%	87%	2%	60%	36%	4%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	53%	43%	5%				10%	87%	2%	73%	22%	5%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	53%	41%	6%				18%	80%	2%	64%	28%	8%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	26%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	29%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	45%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Who Have Lived in the Area for Over 30 Years)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	53%	44%	4%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	38%	56%	6%	61%	34%	5%				26%	69%	5%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	37%	57%	6%	64%	30%	6%				26%	71%	3%
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	48%	46%	6%	74%	21%	5%				38%	54%	8%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	48%	47%	5%	73%	22%	5%				38%	56%	6%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	46%	47%	7%	69%	24%	7%				39%	55%	6%
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	54%	42%	4%				22%	74%	4%	61%	32%	6%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	61%	34%	5%				29%	64%	6%	73%	21%	6%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	59%	35%	6%				31%	63%	6%	68%	26%	6%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	62%	34%	4%				36%	61%	2%	67%	26%	7%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	29%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	21%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	50%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Who Have Children)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	63%	34%	3%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	45%	48%	7%	68%	25%	7%				25%	63%	12%
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	48%	47%	5%	72%	25%	3%				37%	44%	18%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	48%	49%	3%	71%	27%	2%				37%	57%	6%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	44%	51%	5%	66%	30%	4%				31%	63%	6%
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	39%	55%	6%	59%	37%	5%				25%	51%	24%
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	62%	32%	6%				13%	76%	11%	74%	22%	5%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	54%	41%	5%				9%	87%	4%	63%	31%	6%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	55%	42%	2%				7%	91%	2%	66%	32%	3%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	58%	38%	4%				12%	83%	5%	71%	25%	4%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	31%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	27%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	42%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Who Have Children)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	53%	40%	7%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	40%	55%	5%	70%	28%	2%				15%	83%	2%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	39%	56%	4%	72%	28%					16%	80%	4%
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	47%	49%	4%	80%	17%	3%				20%	75%	4%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	44%	52%	3%	77%	22%	1%				17%	76%	6%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	41%	57%	2%	71%	28%	1%				22%	72%	6%
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	50%	43%	7%				16%	79%	5%	50%	46%	4%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	57%	40%	3%				22%	74%	3%	60%	40%	
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	57%	39%	4%				24%	72%	4%	60%	40%	
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	58%	39%	3%				24%	75%	1%	65%	35%	

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	33%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	25%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	43%

**Assessment of Option to Allow Operation of Facility under New Environmental Conditions without Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Who Do Not Have Children)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would allow the MERC facility in Biddeford to continue operating through its useful life BUT under new environmental conditions? Under this option the odor, smog and ozone would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently. The facility could continue to operate after 2013 if the company chose to invest in the facility. That is, no specific date would be set for the facility to close BUT the cities would still retain the option to close the facility with two years notice for a cash payment.	59%	36%	5%									
DRAWBACKS												
If the facility remains in operation, businesses MAY not choose to invest in and develop the property surrounding the Maine Energy Recovery Company.	45%	48%	7%	71%	21%	8%				23%	72%	5%
If the facility remains in operation, while pollution will be reduced substantially there will still be some smog and ozone emissions and odor.	45%	49%	5%	70%	25%	5%				42%	58%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco related to hauling waste to the MERC facility in Biddeford.	47%	48%	5%	70%	26%	5%				52%	48%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be an impact on infrastructure such as the roads, streets, and bridges in Biddeford and Saco.	46%	49%	5%	70%	26%	4%				47%	53%	
If the facility remains in operation, there will continue to be increased town expenses for public safety amounting to 50,000 to 150,000 dollars each year the facility is in operation.	42%	50%	8%	62%	29%	9%				49%	48%	3%
ADVANTAGES												
The MERC pays 1.3 million dollars in taxes to the city of Biddeford each year. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	55%	38%	6%				18%	76%	6%	56%	34%	10%
The MERC currently employs 85 people.	54%	41%	5%				15%	82%	4%	60%	33%	6%
Because of benefits that Biddeford and Saco have as host communities under the current agreement with the Maine Energy Recovery Company, less money is spent on the transfer and disposal of trash. That is, you pay about 45/30 dollars less per year for the pick-up and disposal of your household's trash.	54%	41%	5%				12%	87%	1%	64%	28%	8%
Because the MERC facility incinerates wastes, the volume of solid waste is reduced by 70%. This waste would otherwise require additional landfill space.	57%	38%	5%				18%	81%	1%	64%	27%	9%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	31%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	27%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	43%

**Assessment of Option Setting Date for Closure
(Respondents Who Do Not Have Children)**

	All			Initially supporting			Initially opposing			Change opinion		
	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure	% Support	% Oppose	% Unsure
Would you support or oppose an agreement that would close the MERC facility by 2013 and until then allow it to operate under new environmental conditions? Under this option smog, ozone, and odor would be reduced and mercury testing would be conducted more frequently until the facility was closed in 2013.	55%	40%	5%									
DRAWBACKS												
In order to insure that MERC would close the facility by 2013, Biddeford and Saco would have to pay the MERC an incentive to close. The cost may be as much as 10 million dollars for Biddeford/Saco to be paid for through a bond. This would mean about 100 dollars for every household each year for the 20 years of the bond.	37%	56%	6%	58%	38%	4%				28%	66%	7%
If the MERC facility were to close, Biddeford would lose the tax revenues now paid by MERC which amounted to 1.3 million dollars this year. This might result in higher taxes that would have to be paid by residents if not offset by taxes from new business. This might be as much as 165 dollars per household each year for a house that is assessed at 200,000 dollars. (asked of Biddeford residents only)	42%	53%	5%	66%	27%	6%				32%	68%	
If the MERC facility were to close, the cost for transferring and disposing of trash may increase. This might increase the cost of disposing of your household's trash by 45/30 dollars per year.	49%	45%	6%	72%	23%	5%				43%	51%	6%
If the MERC facility were to close, 85 jobs would be eliminated at the facility.	47%	49%	4%	68%	29%	3%				41%	56%	3%
The MERC facility helps reduce the volume of trash that must be disposed of by 70%. If the facility were to close, Saco and Biddeford would have to find another means of disposing of trash, most likely requiring additional landfill space.	44%	50%	5%	67%	28%	5%				37%	62%	1%
ADVANTAGES												
While the new environmental conditions would reduce smog and ozone, they would not be completely eliminated. It would also not completely eliminate odor associated with the facility. Closing the MERC facility would mean the facility would no longer produce these types of pollution and odor.	52%	42%	5%				16%	80%	3%	63%	29%	8%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may free up property for other uses in downtown Biddeford. This may help new development and help revitalize the downtown area.	58%	35%	7%				23%	69%	8%	68%	24%	8%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help increase property values for the property in areas near the facility.	56%	38%	6%				27%	68%	5%	59%	35%	6%
Closing the MERC facility by 2013 may help to reduce truck traffic in the downtown areas of Biddeford and Saco since trucks will no longer be hauling waste to the facility.	59%	36%	4%				29%	68%	2%	68%	28%	4%

% Supporting Given all Drawbacks	27%
% Opposing Given all Advantages	21%
% Opinions Change Based on Advantages and Drawbacks	52%