

CLIMATE CHANGE BOARD

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 28 SEPTEMBER 2022, 4PM

Present:

Councillor Cait Taylor (Chairman)
Councillor Diana Jones
Councillor George Potter
Councillor Paul Spooner
Councillor Deborah Seabrook
Councillor Catherine Young

In attendance:

Alistair Atkinson, Guildford Environmental Forum
Francesca Castelo, Economic Policy Officer
Ian Doyle, Joint Strategic Director: Transformation & Governance
Debbie Hickman, GBC Comms
Nat Prodger, Climate Change Officer
Marieke van der Reijden, Executive Head of Service: Assets and Property
Carrie Anderson, Senior Democratic Services Officer

Action By

17. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Apologies for absence were received from Professor Bob Nichol (UNIS), Chris Wheeler (EHoS: Environmental Services) and Ben McCallan (SCC).

Debbie Hickman was welcomed as a new member of the Comms Team.

18. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 August 2022 were approved.

The Board agreed that it would be supportive to run an Action Tracker to review and monitor business and progress. This would be arranged by Democratic Services.

Carrie Anderson

An action was outstanding for Alistair to circulate a paper concerning natural capital and health and well-being costs. Action: Alistair Atkinson

Alistair Atkinson

It was recommended a specialist in carbon costs be invited to address the Board and to set out any opportunities for the Council. The Finance Team would be approached for more detail. Action:

Nat Prodger

Nat Prodger

[DSO note. The Board felt that the minutes did not set out ownership for the above outstanding actions, however this was not the case as there had been paragraph movement on the document.]

19. GBC EMISSIONS REPORT 2020-21 - PRESENTATION

The Climate Change Officer gave a presentation.

The Guildford Borough Council (GBC) Scope 1,2 and 3 Carbon Emissions Report for 2020/21 was written by the Association for Public Sector Excellence (APSE). It was prepared in March and revised in July 2022.

The evidence baseline was for 2008/09. The calculations had been made in-house at GBC and had been reviewed by APSE. The net carbon footprint from Scopes 1,2, and 3 for 20/21 was 6,057 tCO₂e. From the baseline data that represented a reduction of 9519 tCO₂e or 61%.

Due to the pandemic 20/21 was classed as a 'non-standard' year and the data should not be used for comparison against standard years. This was because of lockdowns and closure of the leisure centre etc. Data from 2021/22 had been commissioned and would be compared against data from 2019. Data informing the new Action Plan would be drawn from 2019 data.

Scope 1 related to direct emissions, such as gas and fuel consumption, and was the largest source of emissions at 2,393 tCO₂e per annum. Council vehicles accounted for 920 tCO₂e per annum and it was noted that waste vehicles accounted for 68% of Council vehicle emissions. Scope 2 related to indirect emissions (electricity use) and accounted for 2,116 tCO₂e per annum. Scope 3 emissions accounted for 644 tCO₂e per annum, however Scope 3 emissions needed focus to ensure that there was full capture. Scopes 1 and 2 accounted for 98.4% of all Council emissions.

The revised Carbon Trajectory report had also been received from APSE in July. For the year 2020-21 the Council had produced less carbon emissions than forecast because it had been a 'non-standard' year. Therefore, the year 20221-22 was expected to see a rise as business returned to normal. The trajectory report provided an indicative cost to the Council to attain net-zero by 2030 for Scopes 1 and 2 at £ 58.6M. It was recommended in the report that the Council undertake a review of all vehicles and assets and provide an action plan setting out what interventions could be undertaken, along with a calculation of capital costs and funding opportunities. Additional recommendations from the report were to centralise and store all Scope 1 and 2 emissions data via

SystemsLink¹; to develop an understanding of and report on Scope 3 emissions; that waste disposal data be recorded and reported; and that Scope 3 be expanded to include purchased goods and services. Under SystemsLink the 331 electricity meters that the Council were responsible for were currently under review to seek to reduce emissions. A new carbon tab would be included on the SystemsLink carbon table to ensure that renewable energy generation could be counted to offset as energy reduction?? Several assumptions had been made to calculate Scope 3 emissions. Currently, only water supply was calculated and not used water treatment. It had been assumed that 95% of the water used by the Council had been returned to the sewer. Carbon emissions associated with used water treatment were twice as high as that of water supply. The Council would need to monitor used water more closely and work with the water company to improve emissions.

Nathaniel
Prodger

Business travel by rail was included in Scope 3 calculations but had not been included in the report as it had been assumed that during the pandemic there would have been very few such journeys.

Emissions from waste disposal had quadrupled due to conversion factors. Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS) had said that conversion factors were regularly reviewed and updated to provide more accurate and relevant data. Refuse waste was calculated as 5% sent to an energy from waste facility and 95% as landfill. Waste from the Freedom Leisure sites were not included in the report, but gas and electricity were as GBC were responsible for payment of the gas and electricity bills.

Members of the Board made the following comments:

It was queried how working from home during the pandemic and the general shift in behaviour in working arrangements post-pandemic by both officers and councillors might be measured in terms of emissions. The 'Cost of Living Crisis' might also result in a change in the other direction with a greater office attendance due to warm offices. It was suggested that it would be an interesting topic that might be taken up nationwide or a potential study for the Council itself. It was noted that the Council had a policy of 'agile working' in place whereby officers could work from home 50% time which might help with calculations.

In future calculations of business travel emissions would include all rail travel but should also include all forms of travel including flights, albeit rare. Details of tickets and costs had been forwarded to APSE for calculation. APSE was also suggesting reviews of mileage information which had not yet been provided.

Nathaniel
Prodger

¹ [SystemsLink - Cost effective energy management software \(systems-link.com\)](https://www.systems-link.com)

It was estimated in the region of 50 tCO₂e per annum was offset by the borough via land use and forestry. Further offsetting might be increased by extending greenspaces or renewables. It was suggested the offsetting data be included on the pie chart graphic in future. The Board was reminded that it was important to mainly focus on the reduction of emissions from gas and electricity use rather than to seek offsetting opportunities, although this was an area of great interest.

Regarding the inclusion of goods and services in the calculation of Scope 3 emissions, it was queried how value for money and consideration of the Council's financial circumstances could be reconciled with a low carbon agenda. This would be a balance to be struck by procurement when evaluating the benefits to the Council and its overall objectives.

The timescale for moving the waste disposal fleet over to EV was queried and it was noted that Waverley Borough Council had recently agreed to re-engineer its fleet to run on biodiesel at a cost of £100,000. The National Waste Strategy from Government was still awaited and this was expected to impact the Council's plan to move the fleet to EV because it was not clear what type of refuse was to be collected in future and how this would influence the design of the vehicles.

It was suggested Scopes 1 and 2 should be presented separately from Scope 3 as the Council had more control over Scopes 1 and 2. It was also suggested that the trajectory forecast bar chart might be altered to accommodate the data from the 'non-standard' year 2020-21 so that the anticipated increase was explained. The details of the bar chart would be discussed with APSE.

Nathaniel
Prodger

Scope 3 calculation would need to include all goods and services procured by the Council and to include the supply chains of the suppliers/providers to the end of the line. It was suggested that a consultant might be recruited to deliver this work or that a partnership with the University (UNIS) could be appropriate. The importance and potential impact of Scope 3 emissions for the Councils zero-carbon objectives was noted and a decision on which option to select would be taken soon.

Ian Doyle/Cllr
Taylor

It was noted that the Council did have a Procurement Strategy which the Climate Change Officer would review it and it would also be shared with the Board. It was noted that SCC was currently reviewing its procurement strategy with a view to sharing with the Surrey districts and boroughs.

Nathaniel
Prodger

20. CLIMATE CHANGE COMMUNICATIONS PLAN (DRAFT)

The Communications Plan had been reviewed by the Climate Change Officer against several other local councils plans. It was

Nathaniel
Prodger/ Debbie
Hickman

an internal document to sit with the Communications Team.

The draft document identified key stakeholders and the messages that Council would wish to project with regards to Climate Change.

The Communications Plan and the Draft Action Plan were closely aligned.

The key messages would include an infographic to set out what had been achieved by the Council since 2019.

The meeting heard that the Council was responsible for around 1.1% of the emissions coming from across the borough and held an important leadership role in encouraging and empowering others to take action to reduce emissions by example and by highlighting the benefits in terms of costs and lifestyle. This leadership role should be clearly set out in the 'Aims' section of the document.

The terms 'net-zero' and 'carbon-neutral' were not interchangeable and the former had a legal implication. The draft should ensure this was clear.

The Board was invited to submit any further comment on the draft by email.

21. CLIMATE CHANGE ACTION PLAN (DRAFT)

The Climate Change Officer presented the draft Climate Change Action Plan.

Nathaniel
Prodger

It was noted that the governance route for the draft was be discussed at the Joint Executive Advisory Board meeting on 10 November before being considered for adoption by the Executive on 24 November.

A forward for the document needed to be written and it was felt that either the Chairman as Lead Councillor for Climate Change and/or the Leader of the Council with the Joint Chief Executive would be appropriate.

This was to be an outward facing, external public document and as such was presented to be accessible to all using basic language and assuming no prior knowledge of the issues and terminology. It was suggested a technical summary might be included.

The policy contexts ran from global to local, going on to explain the intentions and position of the Council and how those objectives would be achieved including working with residents, business and partner agencies. The draft was comprehensive and set out finance projections, deliverables, reviews and governance routes.

Greenhouse gas emissions data had been drawn from national

statistics but would be updated with APSE data as and when there was an update or revision. In this aspect it was a working document. There had been revisions in carbon measurements over the years and this was explained within the document, for example from 2018 agriculture had been included in carbon calculations.

The draft had been drawn from Waverley Borough Council's action plan which had been commended in national rankings as well as the SCC Greener Futures programme and the Council's existing High Level Action Plan.

It was reported that transport plans around the country were being revisited for low carbon and there were opportunities for Government funding. Where possible the Council might invest sufficiently to get projects ready to attract such funding.

Social equity and a just transition might be highlighted in the draft as something the Council was aware of and incorporating into plans. It was suggested the Council might work with the University and public health partners in this regard.

It had been proposed that an officer working group be set up to review the actions in the draft plan and to identify ownership across the Council and what work was already underway. This group would feedback to update the draft plan.

The matter of any Climate Assembly being run by the Council was subject to a mandate evaluation process and was included in the draft action plan at 8.4.

It was noted that 'buy-in' for the action plan was vital and needed to be obtained at the highest level of the Council to be successful. The action plan should be a 'living' document with actions being moved to an action log and new actions added over time and reflective of changing technologies etc.

It was understood a local walking and cycling infrastructure project would be developed with SCC, probably under the Greener Futures programme and the Council should take every opportunity to promote that work.

Any further comments were to be emailed to the Climate Change Officer and to copy in the rest of the Board.

The Climate Change Officer was commended for the work.

22. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was a discussion about taking forward the Board's review of the Council's Climate Change declaration motion, to potentially include biodiversity and air quality and to define the Council's

understanding of 'net-zero' as proposed at the previous meeting.

Alastair kindly agreed to submit a draft rewording or a list of questions for the Board to take forward the discussion at the next meeting.

Alastair Atkinson

The timescale for the review was not dependent upon the adoption of the draft action plan and could be put back to February full Council. It would be added to the agenda for the next meeting and be included on the new action tracker.

Carrie Anderson

A Green Bus Stops presentation was proposed by Cllr. Taylor, Cllr Potter disagreed that the presentation should be held at the CCB rather to be shown at a separate dedicated meeting.

Cllr Taylor/Cllr
Potter

23. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

Wednesday 30 November from 10:30am. Via Teams and in person in Room 6 (Hurtmore), GBC offices, Millmead.