

PROSIECT GWYRDD JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday 17 September, 2012 – 5.00pm

LOCATION: Rhymney Room, Ty Penallta, Ystrad Mynach, Caerphilly

Present:	Initials
Elected Members:	
Councillor Russell Goodway, Cardiff City Council	RG
Councillor Ashley Govier, Cardiff City Council	AG
Councillor David Poole, Caerphilly County Borough Council	DP
Councillor Keith Reynolds, Caerphilly County Borough Council	KR
Councillor Bryan Jones, Monmouthshire County Council	ВЈ
Councillor Phil Murphy, Monmouthshire County Council	PM
Councillor Ray Truman, Newport City Council	RT
Councillor Gail Giles, Newport City Council	GG
Councillor Rob Curtis, Vale of Glamorgan CC	RC
Officers:	
Mike Williams, Project Director, Prosiect Gwyrdd	MW
Andrew Kerr, SRO & Business Advisor, Prosiect Gwyrdd	AK
Sian Humphries, Lead Legal Officer, Cardiff City Council	SH
Marcia Sinfield, Cardiff City Council	MS
Dave Harris, Business Advisor, Monmouthshire County Council	DH
Sheila Davies, Corporate Director, Newport City Council	SD
Andrew Morris, Newport City Council	AM
Marc Falconer, Lead Finance Officer, Cardiff CC,	MF
Mark Williams, Caerphilly County Borough Council	MW
Tara King, Business Advisor, Cardiff City Council	TK
Dan Perkins, Legal Officer, Caerphilly CBC	DP
Clifford Parish, Vale of Glamorgan CC	СР
lan Lloyd-Davies, Communications Officer, Prosiect Gwyrdd	ID
Miriam Durkin, Democratic Services Officer, Newport City Council	MD

Page 1 of 6















Apologies: Councillor Neil Moore, Caerphilly County Borough Council and	
C Salter, Cardiff CC	















No	Item	Action
47	Appointment of Chairman	That Councillor Russell Goodway (Cardiff City Council) be appointed as Chair.
48	Apologies for Absence	
	Apologies for Absence were received from Councillor Moore (Vale of Glamorgan County Council)	Noted
49	Minutes The Minutes of 12 December, 2011 were confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair ((whilst it was acknowledged that there were only two Members present who were at this meeting).	Noted
50	Communications Plan	
	A report upon the structure of the proposed communications for Preferred Bidder was considered. This included reference to Member involvement, public and media announcement and attendance at public events.	To agree the structure and process shown in the Communications Plan set out in the Report, on the understanding that the Project Board will determine those issues identified in the Report.
51	Draft Statement of Accounts 2011-12	
	Consideration was given to a report seeking approval of the Statement of Accounts for 2011-12 ahead of the statutory deadline of 30 September, 2012. The report included, as Appendix A, the audited Statement of Accounts 2011-12 and at Appendix B, the Audit of Financial Statements Report issued by the Wales Audit Office (WAO).	1. That the Statement of Accounts for the financial year 2011-12 and the content of the Letter of Representation to the External Auditors be approved.
		2. That the Chairman be

Page 3 of 6















authorised to sign these documents on behalf of the Joint Committee along with the Treasurer and the Senior Responsible Officer, where appropriate.

52 Finance Monitoring Report 2012-13 – Month 4

Consideration was given to a report providing an update of the financial position and projected out-turn for the Prosiect Gwyrdd budgets based on the first four months of the 2012-13 financial year.

MF reported the present position as tabulated within the Report which showed projected unfunded expenditure of £125,000, with the balance of the Reserve Account of £571,951 having been brought forward from 2011-12 being fully expended.

The JWA permitted the Joint Committee to draw down from the Reserve up to a cap of 5% of the annual approved budget. The additional draw down of £124,238 from the Reserve to assist in funding 2012-13 expenditure represented 12.8% of the annual approved budget for 2012-13. This would require formal approval from the Partner Councils and it was recommended that this request be formally made when the Joint Committee recommended its 2013-14 budget for approval by the Partner Councils at the December, 2012 Joint Committee meeting.

MF reported that the Joint Committee were being asked to note the position at this stage.

Members questioned the additional amount that Partner Authorities would be asked to approve following the December meeting and its timing. MS confirmed that this allowed Partner Authorities time to consider the request for additional funding as part of their budget setting processes but at this stage was being flagged up so Members were aware of the projected financial position.

MF confirmed that the WG would be approached regarding possible additional funding.

RT (Newport CC) made the point that any request from the Joint Committee for additional funding would be examined

- 1. That the actual spend to date and projected additional gross expenditure of £191,738 for 2012-13 be noted.
- 2. That the proposal to fully utilise the Joint Committee Reserve and the additional partner contributions of £25,000 per partner for 2012-13 be noted.
- 3. That the drawdown from the Reserve will require Partner Council approval and this request will be included in the budget report being presented to the Joint Committee in December, 2012 be noted.
- 4. That the projected 2013-14 expenditure of

Page 4 of 6













closely with other priorities by Newport CC and that he would hope that the WG would be contacted well before the December meeting.

The Chair indicated that the Joint Committee sought an assurance that the December 2012 Budget Report would include the full disclosure of the financial and legal implications before they were requested to make any decisions relating to the additional funding required from the Partner Authorities.

£401, 667 and the additional Partner contributions of £49,000 per partner required to fund this expenditure be noted.

53 **Presentation**

MW made a presentation to Members giving an overview of frequently asked questions in relation to this project. A full list of project-specific frequently asked questions are published on the Prosiect Gwyrdd website and included in the report submitted to the Joint Committee.

Noted (the presentation was subsequently circulated to Members)

Questions included:-

Did the Project have a preferred technology? Alternatives to incineration (such as MBT) Will incineration reduce the level of recycling? Guaranteed Minimum Tonnage (GMT) Failure to deliver GMT? PG vs. WG Waste Profile Why does the contract have to be 25 years? Isn't such a long contract inflexible? What happens to ash? Isn't the ash toxic? Is an incinerator bad for public health? How do we ensure the Contractor does what he said he'd do?

The responses included in the presentation were expanded by MW and he responded to further questions/clarification from Members. These included alternative technologies, WG preferences, the criteria within original documentation to Bidders, tonnages and the position if these vary, that the residual ash would be safely transported and disposed of at licensed facilities and the Health Protection Agency (HPA) view, as detailed in their reports and reported at all the Member Briefings which they also attended.

There was also a "powerful set of contract management tools" which would be used to ensure the Contractor does what he has said he would do.

The Chair confirmed with Members that they fully understood the process and the tools in place to protect its integrity and

Page 5 of 6

















	encouraged their scrutiny of what was being said.	
	Members reiterated concerns regarding additional funding and that any increase in pollution, not only from incineration but any source should be avoided.	
54	Date of Next Meeting	
	22 October, 2012 at 5.00p.m. at County Hall, Cardiff	Noted











