

Submarine: Incinerator/Energy from Waste Survey

Sample

Conducted to Submarine's database of 2000 email addresses of which there were 398 responses.

Profile

Respondents are between the ages of 35 – 65. Largely office workers at management level with regular Internet access.

Rationale

The survey was conducted for the purposes of providing an indication of public opinion and depth of knowledge on certain subjects. In the States meeting of February there is one Amendment and one Requete (possibly two) being laid before the States all of which have slightly different purposes.

93million spent elsewhere

Since the States decided to appoint Suez in 2009 there has clearly been a lot of noise by various oppositions to have that decision overturned. There has been claim and counter claim, proposals for other solutions; petitions and, recently a threat of Judicial Review. Before the States of Guernsey go into their February meeting we decided to poll our database on a number of areas. Especially important, from our perspective, was to look at the "£93million budget". PSD and Treasury have stated that this will be a loan paid back via the gate fee; some elements of the opposition seem to be suggesting that it's Capital Expenditure. Is there a difference between a loan and an expense? Do the public understand this? Or do they think that no incinerator means more schools?

If I were King of Guernsey.....

Tipping our hat to the Law of Unintended Consequences and recognising that, within a year, respondents may have either changed their minds, become more entrenched in their views or possibly even actually have an opinion. Hypothetically speaking if the respondents had absolute power, what would they decide?

Should the States approve the Deputy Lowe Amendment?

Response	Percentage
Yes	56.41 %
No	31.79 %
I don't know	11.79 %

Should the States approve the Deputy Kuttelwascher Requete?

Response	Percentage
Yes	54.45 %
No	31.41 %
I don't know	14.14 %

Should the States approve the Deputy Matthews Amendment?

Response	Percentage
Yes	58.55 %
No	31.09 %
I don't know	10.36 %

If I were King of Guernsey I would.....

Response	Percentage
I don't know	2.04 %
Sign the Suez contract and be done with the subject	22.96 %
Purchase Les Vardes quarry and fill it in for the next 80 years	8.67 %
Change our Waste Strategy: kerbside and more segregation	59.18 %
Other	7.14 %

If the States do not go ahead with the Suez proposal, can they use the £93million elsewhere?

Response	Percentage
I don't know	12.82 %
Yes, they can build infrastructure	22.56 %
No, it's a loan	64.62 %

Comments

Response
I've lost the will to live on the subject
For once in my life, I thought the States had shown some bottle when agreeing last year to proceed with the Suez proposal. Now, on the back of the usual misinformation being peddled by well-intentioned, but ultimately, misguided people, it looks like the years of work and millions of pounds that has been expended on exploring and rehashing the same issues time and time again is going to be wasted and we'll be back to the drawing board. It won't be long before the waste starts piling up on the streets (I seem to recall that Sicilly had a similar problem a while back) and, at that point, I shall take great delight in reminding any of those politicians that voted for the Requete(s) that they are responsible for the mess that we will literally be standing in. As for the fact that we will be the laughing stock of the outside world if the States changes its mind AGAIN, the reputational damage it will cause and the fact that no right-minded company will ever want to do business with this Island again...well, don't get me started!
What a load of Rubbish!
Suez is just too costly and risky; 25 years is too long to commit to. Even without complete certainty it is obvious that some other options are better and cheaper.
Buy some time and export to Jersey as they'll be pleased to have it. During that time, investigate emerging trends and scientific knowledge/advice to ensure that we increasingly conform to sustainable environment without destroying our competitive edge. However, it appears that the whole population and their dogs have their own mainly uninformed opinions. We must pursue the goal of reducing energy consumption and more of a recycling society. But, the States must make an informed decision with open debate to ensure that the majority of islanders agree. Water may become an increasingly valuable commodity with global warming, so we mustn't fill in our quarries.
There should be far more emphasis on reduction of waste and recycling, including the introduction of compulsory kerbside recycling.
Typcial States nonsense! The sooner we get rid of the the current lot, the better. We need to return to a States where the majority of the deputies had some business experience. The current lot are (mainly) useless.
As i see it we have 10 years to send waste to jersey, we have issues with health and education that require immediate attention. Beaucamp school is falling apart and the cuts at Health effect everyone. The islanders are being asked more and more to give money via tax to bail out the islands, what happens when the young future earners leave this god forsaken place and not tax payers are left ! Just white elephants and fat cats !

From what I have read about the track record of Suez I'd not touch them with a bargepole!! We should waste money on the "get out" payment right now!

the states are a joke and keep spending money they havent got, i bet theres some back handers going on somewhere. we need to look at recycling more and more efficient and cheaper ways of sorting our waste.

With regard to 'If I were King of Guernsey', I believe other options should be made available. Segregation is okay, as long as we can ship off to be recycled accordingly and the balance is then incinerated, via Jersey perhaps?

At the end of the day you have to give our politicians and civil servants the benefit of any doubt that they are acting in our best interests. How can anyone (other than supposed experts) be certain of which is the best answer for waste disposal in Guernsey? The maxim, a little knowledge is a dangerous thing, springs to mind here! I have a little knowledge and I can honestly say I don't know what the answer is. I suspect the majority of us feel this way.

I was a States member back in 2002 and voted for incineration but times have since moved on, Jersey will have built a brand new and too large a plant in the meanwhile. So why should we try to copy them, it is all of 20 miles away. Would two small towns 20 miles apart elsewhere build a large incinerator each ? of course not. So let us use the time afforded to us by using the Jersey plant in continue and explore new technologies even if they are not proven at present, they will be. If I had my time again I would not have voted the way I did 8 years ago. Martin Ozanne. former minister (in a previous life)

Of course they can use the money elsewhere. If they can borrow £93 million for Suez they can borrow £93 million for something more worthwhile. The total cost of the Suez facility including operational charges, gate fees (indexed linked) is at least £260 million over 25 years at today's money. In 2037 pounds it will be skyward of £400 million. We should be able to sort our waste for minimal capital cost and operational charges of maximum £4 million per year. That would be much cheaper than Suez over 25 years and we would have resources to sell - electricity, heat, compost, recyclates. Suez could do this work for us - but the tendering process and tendering document was fundamentally wrong.

Approximately half of the loan is from the Contingency Reserve. The States could resolve to do what they like with it.

It's a loan from T&R. It's been debated time and time again. We've elected them to represent us and make the best decisions for the island. They've made that decision after hours of debate and they should stick with it. We simply can't start again, it takes too long. We need reliable and proven technology that will allow the island to be self-sufficient. None of the 'alternatives' can tick all of those boxes. Yes, it's a lot of money but so was St Sampson's High, the new airport terminal, the new clinical block, Beau Sejour and the list goes on and no-one can argue that they weren't essential investment in our island infrastructure. We can only hope that

deputies don't listen to a vocal minority but look at the facts before them and make the best decision for the island. That's what we elected them to do.

Rather than bury their heads in the sand like they normally do, they should look at all the different waste proposals, Its stupid to say they are going ahead with one proposal because no one came forward, with other initiatives, the Suez Proposal is the wrong choice here, I don't want to be contributing to this for the rest of my life, I live in the North I don't want The skies where I live poluted with smog, my house devalued because of it, I bet the states haven't thought of what it will be like to live Like, I'm voting no for Suez

If Suez goes ahead, we won't bother to recyle anything.

The Suez proposal was agreed on by the states last year with a large mojority. The Government have to stay with the decision it made. When a sewage plant comes into line in years to come the Suez plant can dispose of the residue. The rise will be 60p per household per week after 2013.

Assist Parishes to collect all domestic Black and 'Green' bags of "dry recyclables". Commercial loads to MURF. Contaminated timber to Micro Incinerator producing steam for Autoclave to sort black bags,clean timber grindings and low grade plastics for moulding as per Brouard. In Vessel Composting for food and garden waste. Top quality sold to Garden Centres. Poor grade and sewage solids top up Micro Incinerator for maximum efficiency.

Common sense needed !!!

£93 million is a waste in its self. Take the long term unenployed and the unemployable and make them sort the rubbish for recyclable materials. Take all the compastable waste and compost it. Then ban the import of anything that cannot be recycled.

With a blank piece of paper you would ship it all to either Jersey and then France ad infinitum. But some job's worth said we are responsible for our own waste. So in which case why do we ship recycled stuff off island.

Scott Ogier was on the radio this morning saying that we will never reach consensus over the waste solution because people oppose the Suez proposal on such varied grounds - cost, environmental, social etc - and that no one solution can keep everyone happy. However, the very fact that there are so many objections on so many fronts demonstrates that it is absolutely not the right option for Guernsey. The common sense answer is to look at the bigger picture with the primary aim of reducing Guernsey's waste even further, reducing the size of the problem and therefore automatically reducing the cost, environmental and social implications of any solution or solutions that are presented. Even if, as Scott Ogier suggests, not everyone will be entirely happy, at least they will be a lot happier than they are right now. At the moment nobody is happy except Suez, a company that is set to make many millions

of pounds from this plan, and Bernard Flouquet, a man I'm beginning to suspect is either extremely arrogant or a little bit deranged.

We need to concentrate on recycling, kerbside and otherwise. We also need to think to the future. There is a danger that states only think to their own lifetime.

We should export our waste Jersey which is the easiest, cleanest and less expensive option for the next 10 years. During that time we should be able to sort out (Won't hold my breath) alternative means of exporting our recycled waste and gain revenue from doing so by selling all our glass and plastics etc., which should pay for kerbside recycling/segregation.

I would expect that Guernsey will have difficulty finding any commercial entities to do business with them - if a deal with the States (i.e. States resolution) only reflects the current sentiment and is likely to change.

The original incinerator should have gone ahead. It would have been built by now. Not wasted millions of our money. Other interested parties should have made themselves known before now. If we delay again, it will cost the tax payer even more.

Ahhhhh..... bring in a benign dictator!

Reduce-Reuse-Recycle-use Jy as buffer-DON'T saddle Gy with a generation of Suez cost. (However, this needs politicians with long foresight and social integrity!)

It is no wonder there is such voter apathy in Guernsey. Decisions have been made and passed by the States, everyone had a chance to register interest in tendering and if accepted to submit a bona fide tender for consideration. Now a few wealthy business men who are knowledgeable and able to stir up public feeling over the issue are causing mischief and as a result undermining confidence in our elected representatives. We may not have the perfect government, and indeed I suspect the States are far from perfect but we are better than many and are as a result of this being made to look as if we have a government which is weak and ineffectual. Let us not forget that the EFW plant is also a recycling centre, energy being the product of the final incineration process only.

This is too simplistic, most questions have more than one answer!

It is ok to change our mind, times change and so should we. Our island needs to start thinking commercially.

the waste industry is growing, keep the business and money in the hands of local people. Bernard Flouquet and PSD should step down

Your penultimate question is meaningless in its current form as it does not offer the true option "by whatever means the Island chooses to cover the inevitably higher cost of processing waste in future rather than continuing with uncontrolled landfill"

The States has made the decision, those who failed to persuade otherwise (both inside and outside the States) should accept the point and get on with their lives!

there are lots of options which could be implemented at source to deal with different products rather than just burning the lot. I do not see why Guernsey has not approached Jersey to take a small amount of product that can not be dealt with. If we put all our eggs in one basket this then ties us to feeding the one "machine" be it burning or whatever. The 93m could be loaned to implement better infrastructure and explore minimising the waste at source.

During an 80 yr period ,and possibly within the next 12/20 yrs they will invent a new process for dealing with rubbish,that will most likly cause them to reopen the old tips to enable them to reprocess the rubbish already buried there.They can take out separete loans for low level infrastructure over longer periods should it ever be desperatly required,WHEN our finances improve.Only spend when its really neccessary.

The Suez proposal is outdated technology and the cost seems way to high in comparison with other options.

Technology is moving so fast that in 10-15 years time there will likely be a better solution to the islands waste needs.

I think it's incredible that this discussion is taking place after the tender process has been completed and all the ticks were in the boxes.

This is a half-assed survey. No one I ask can explain why we don't have kerbside recycling today. Why are we only investigating exporting waste to Jersey this week? This isn't PSD's fault. They have done what they were asked to do. Hace a look at Jersey's incinerator under construction. What an ugly piece of work!

Strategy to use waste streams in different ways - inert: landfill. land is a valuable and scarce resource - compostable. compost this It can then be used - recyclable: recycle for re-use - the rest: export/small incinerator/landfill

This whole debate has been dominated by people who have very fixed, utopian views of waste management which are not ideals shared by the majority of islanders, but they have been able to influence public opinion through continual misinformation and misrepresentation. Very well organsied and very well fudned, but nevertheless workign to their own narrow agenda and they will only be satisfied when that is imposed on the rest of us. However out of all the fog that has been created has come Heath Robinson solutions, put forward by opportunistic developers who are more than happy to exploit all this uncertainty to foist their products and wild claims on a now receptive and confused audience. And if these vested interested do eventually prevail, one thing you can rest assured is true - the main protagonists in all of this will be no happier with these new solutions than with the safe, reliable and proven system Suez has put forward. But then be careful what you wish for.

Would you ship rubbish to an African nation? There is no difference.

It horrifies me to think that they might make the wrong decision, ie go ahead with the Suez plant, just because they feel they need to make a decision. It is far better to save money, and at the same time encourage more recycling, by looking still further into other options. The fact that there is doubt about the Suez plant must indicate that it is not the right way forward. I also feel that, to tie us into something that may be obsolete in a few years' time, for 25 years, is ludicrous.

As King, I would have liked to tick "use Les Vardes" and "change the waste strategy". The waste strategy is most important, because if we recycle cardboard, waxed cartons, glass, plastics and paper and compost waste vegetable matter, there is very little left to go into landfill or to burn. It pretty much leaves only leftover food. I give mine to the seagulls but we should explore anaerobic digestion plants and other means of safely disposing of anything which can't be recycled. We need a comprehensive recycling strategy and something clean to pick up what's left - Guernsey could be a world leader in this and yes, we may have to pay for it, but so we should.

Difficult to sum up how I feel. The whole process has been a disaster. Those in control of island decision making had their own agenda and refused to listen to 'greener' voices. It has been the ultimate example of mis-government and procrastination and is likely to cost the tax payer dear. Islanders are waking up to the inadequacies of our present system and individuals are exercising their democratic rights in a way that we have not seen in the past 50 years or more!! A comment invitation after each of the above questions would have provided us with an opportunity to expand and clarify our thoughts.

What was the point of the last two questions? I suspect the author doesn't understand how it will be funded either. Heavily loaded survey questions!!

How do you think the proposed Suez plant is funded? it is funded by the gate fee- it does not necessarily mean that waste charges will rise as this implies

I am against incineration. Even if the atmospheric discharges were clean, something will go wrong and the discharges may be harmful. It seems to be more expensive than the alternatives which are emerging. To the extent that Suez are tailoring the plant to our needs it is no more a proven technology than the Baltic plant.

One way or another, the taxpayer/Parish rate-payer will fund the operation. Suez rakes it in and takes no risk, which is all taken by the taxpayers/Parish rate-payers. If it doesn't work the way it is planned, or if global/European legislation changes within the next 25 years, the money wasted is for the account of the taxpayer/Parish rate-payer. (Suez take no risk and are not worried, and the present Deputies will have been long-binned!) I think that we should help our sister Island with their oversized system in the short

term, so that we have time to re-evaluate our position. Whether or not ones likes incineration, it will make their system more efficient, in that it will run to a working capacity and will not have the polluting effect brought on by a 'stop-start' operation This re-evaluation should involve taking advice from someone new who does not recommend Suez for anything and everything.

Sack all the bloody deputies and use their pay elsewhere

There are alternatives and PSD know it.

The onus should be put on the public to segregate their rubbish, kerbside collection should be introduced now, and perhaps ship rubbish to Jersey. 93 million is far too much to spend on one project that could be out of date in a few years time (or banned by EU), there will be incentive to recycle if the incinerator plan (Suez) is built. And what about the health problems that could quietly creep upon us, caused by toxic fumes.

What Guernsey really needs is another fleet of trucks bashing around in the middle of the night smashing glass into their recycling bins or holding up huge queues of traffic all day.... Genius.

Has anyone considered whether the alternatives meet the requirements of Environmental Health?

Over the years, the States has turned down everything which would lead them away from an incinerator. They have made this decision over 5 years of debates. This current house has turned down kerbside twice already and not supported a delay while Jersey and micro incineration was investigated. They have no environmental credentials.

Given the chance, debate on this subject will continue for ever. A line has to be drawn and the States do what they were elected to do - make the hard decisions and just accept that it will not be popular with everyone. I have seen many claims against the Suez proposal but no actual proof that alternatives will be really and truly viable and sustainable: it is very easy to criticise something and make claims for something better, but a lot harder to come up with the goods.

What a waste of time and effort!

They have spent years looking into this problem. They reached a conclusion recently, why go over everything again?

Incineration is WRONG. For me it is not about the money it is about the environmental damage. I understand that focussing on the money is the only way to polarise opinion however. The States MUST NOT BE ALLOWED TO GO AHEAD WITH THIS AT ANY COST.

States priorities should be in trying to save money and our environment by adopting one of the cheaper and greener alternatives that have been proposed. They are too preoccupied with losing face, when in fact they have all lost face by following like sheep

down the Suez route.

Get on with it. No more pandering to the bleeding heart liberals with their multi-million pound country houses. The States made the right decision in July, it's time to show the guts to stick with it.

I don't like the 'Brouard' alternative either because it doesn't do enough to encourage people to reduce their waste - everything is taken to the waste processor and it's all turned into some kind of plastic type pallets (will they all be marketable?). We must reduce our own consumption (create less waste in the first place) and be incentivised to do this - i.e. the polluter pays principle - e.g. payment per sack/per household, then have proper kerbside collection of waste, then deal with what's left. I think export to Jersey (not an ideal solution) until we find a better solution will give us a longer 'breathing space'.

Short term solution - investigate shipping to Jersey for say a 5 year period. In that 5 years look at new methods that Guernsey can afford and implement them, at the same time increasing re cycling to as high a level as possible so as to minimise the size of the plant needed and therefore the cost. Thanks to one major mistake (Zero 10) we cannot afford these grandiose schemes.

They should ask themselves whether they would like to live next door to something so large, ugly and potentially dangerous for people in the near vicinity!

Guernsey isn't the place to experiment with insufficiently tested solutions. We don't have anyone "just down the road" to help us out if anything goes wrong. One of the "green" principles is to dispose of waste as close to its source as reasonably feasible.

We elect people that we believe will govern wisely - let them get on with it and then judge them on the results. They do get an appraisal every four years....

If the States decide in the Suez proposal I will ,leave Guernsey.

I don't know what the solution is but I don't like the idea of a huge incinerator costing £93m. I would like to ship our waste to Jersey until we can find a good solution to our waste problem.

The States members have GOT to listen to the public, remember there is a huge silent majority that does not wish to be laden (nor laden future generations) with this massive debt when there are much cheaper alternatives available. Such a pity that it's taken the general public such a long time to wake up to this subject.

As always surveys are difficult to be fit for every ones purpose. You could both change the Waste Strategy and fill the Vardes Quarry. Some how we have a desire to burden the next generation with an incredibly expensive toy dedicated to the vanity of politicians.

if i were king....Waste needs to be looked at more closely to ensure all avenues are explored as technology has moved significantly to improve sorting for recycling and reusing. Kerbside is a key part of this. £93 million.....was/is scheduled to come from gate fees, so you cannot spend what you do not have, unless you raise it through another form of tax. Thanks

We should send our waste to Jersey and elsewhere. We should have a full and proper re-cycling policy. In parts of England you put out a black bag for your rubbish, an orange bag for all your re-cyclables (Councils sort out), and other items such as useable food, garden compost, etc, are arranged. Also, like us in Guernsey, you can have bulk items such as old tv's, fridges, etc, picked up, free of charge. You should also be able to offer and have picked up any items which can be taken to the States depot, where other people can pick them up for nothing or pay a nominal amount for. (Currently you can take and go and pick up such items, but there should be a service as there is with bulk refuse. Over thirty years ago I was Chairman of the Guernsey Environmental Council and many of the things we were suggesting then have thankfully come about, but now more needs to be done..! Tony Webber

Guernsey Ltd cannot afford to spend future money at this uncertain time. There is still the BLACK HOLE to consider as that little problem hasn't been resolved yet. If the money was in the bank it might be OK but it's a loan and a huge sum for an island with a comparatively small GDP. If we go ahead the impact in the future of other projects could be enormous because of the financial restraints it will impose.

Householders should be asked if they would pay extra for kerbside collection, I am sick to death of going to the recycling bins and it breaks my heart to see little old ladies having to take a step with them to get their paper and cardboard in the bin

I would like to see a greener alternative to the incineration plant. Also ninety three million pounds and questions about running costs and future guarantees with the Suez solution seem very worrying indeed. If we can increase recycling and possible shipments to Jersey for a while to other greener alternative are available would be a more sensible solution. Sometimes waiting is the best thing.

Let Brouard proceed. Plan as a fallback exporting to Jersey until Les Vardes is available.

Currently, one can only assume that a deal has already been done behind closed doors to offer Suez our water supply at some stage in the future. I smell a rat!!

If I were King of Guernsey, I would have Bernard interned in Victoria Tower. Of course that would be after he had been tortured, by every means thinkable, possible and impossible.

The island needs an integrated waste strategy. Without a holistic approach we'll never get beyond the incinerator option - Deputy Scott Ogier said as much himself - the states have repeatedly voted out options that might have helped over the years. If the whole

issue had been presented in context, considering all aspects of the island's waste strategy we might have had a much more forward-looking solution by now.

That money could be used for a sewage plant.

Any alternative to mass burn has got to be a better option

Any petition on alternatives should not be signed by children.

Bin the big beast

Source separation, kerbside collections. Anaerobic digester for food waste. A wood chipper for the 9,000 tonnes of wood. With these few measures put into place, our residual waste stream would be reduced to a trickle. There would be no need then for any large end-of-line waste plant. With these measures in place, the remaining residual waste could be landfilled in Les Vardes... because all the biogenic material would have been removed, the waste would be inert and create neither smells or methane. Alternatively it could be sent to Jersey. PSD have spectacularly failed to deliver a waste strategy that accesses the best value from the materials in our rubbish. They have consistently blocked all attempts to reduce the waste stream. They have done everything to ensure that all waste remained in a single waste stream when it is widely recognised that the best way to reduce waste is to split it up at source into its different materials so that each material can realise its true and best value. Because of this, it is no wonder we have a large plant like Suez on the table. We shouldn't be suprised.

this is what peeps forget it is a loan that future generations will be paying for. we would have to import rubbish to keep this monster fed.kick suez into touch now

Just get on with it