



UNIVERSITY OF
KWAZULU-NATAL
INYUVESI
YAKWAZULU-NATALI

The Centre for Civil Society

School of Built Environment and Development Studies
5th Floor, Memorial Tower Building, Howard College Campus
University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, 4041, South Africa
Telephone: +27 (0) 31 260 3577 Fax: +27 (0)31 260 2502
E-mail: pbond@mail.ngo.za Website: <http://ccs.ukzn.ac.za>

2 July 2014

TO: Mr Lerato Mokoena,
Department of Environmental Affairs
LMokoena@environment.gov.za

Ms Vanessa Brueton
Nemai Consulting
147 Bram Fisher Drive, Ferndale
Email: VanessaB@nemai.co.za

RE: EIA PUBLIC COMMENT: *Inadequacy of Final EIA Report for the Proposed Berth 203 to 205 Expansion* (NEAS Ref No.: DEA/EIA/0000988/2012 DEA Ref No.: 14/12/16/3/3/2/275)

This commentary is a follow up from an EIA Public Comment provided to your office on 24 May 2013. That communication was followed by attempts to engage Transnet and its consultants on numerous occasions, all to no avail. Transnet and Nemai have persistently acted in a manner that can be termed 'climate-denialist', and the 3 June 2014 EIA statement is in that tradition.

Indeed on the critical matter of climate, two striking features of the 3 June 2014 EIA statement should serve the DEA as the basis for outright final rejection of Transnet's proposed expansion.

First, the consultants have made no suggested changes to Transnet, in terms of preparing for sea level rise (SLR) and severe storm events. The consultants have simply regurgitated old analysis (the 2013 filing relied on 2008 data), and then misread an Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report (2013) to claim that it is sufficient to contemplate a maximum 0.58 meters of SLR within 50 years. But as the South Durban Community Environmental Alliance (SDCEA) pointed out in great detail in their EIA critique today, *this is a disturbing underestimate of the problem as it will affect Durban*. There are two reasons: the IPCC actually estimated a higher SLR figure than the Transnet consultants identified; and the IPCC is persistently too optimistic (typically by 60 percent), and hence more updated scientific literature is required. The May 2014 estimates by scientists who have now calculated the West Antarctic ice sheet's submersion – which the 2 June 2014 Transnet filing really should have

incorporated – are much higher, and it behoves Transnet to return to the drawing board with the new West Antarctic ice sheet information. The 0.58 meter SLR that Transnet claims is a maximum, is now far below what is likely.

The second major problem with Transnet's filing is that, in spite of numerous requests since 2012, *no provision has been made for CO2 emissions that will be directly caused by the extensive expansion plan*, including trucking emissions associated with millions more containers transported through Durban. Transnet refuses to contemplate the implications of the Cabinet-endorsed *Long-Term Mitigation Scenario* of 2008, which commits to a levelling of emissions during the 2020s and cuts of 34 percent below 2020 levels by the mid-2030s, just at the time the Berths 203-205 capacity will be at their maximum level, and container traffic of the entire Durban port complex is anticipated (by the *National Development Plan*) to reach 20 million units per annum. In recent years, since the 2008 trade crisis, the average container traffic has been only 2.5 million per annum.

In raising this point, Transnet has traditionally used an argument that larger ships (in excess of 10 000 containers/ship) that can be offloaded at the rehabilitated Berths 203-205 are more carbon efficient than the smaller ones (typically less than 8 000 units per ship) that are currently unloaded. However, that argument is specious, because the proper comparison is to a transport and commercial system that is *not* expanding. The EIA should be rejected because it simply fails to contemplate the option of not increasing traffic. In addition, the EIA should be rejected because it fails to seriously contemplate the additional truck traffic that will accompany an eight-fold rise in container transport (drawing both on Berths 203-205 and all the rest of the South Durban port expansion plans). The reason for Transnet's neglect in this regard is simple: if the company did indeed calculate the emissions associated with such expansion, *it would break South Africa's carbon budget*. The likelihood of dramatic increases in carbon taxes and the prospects for full regulation of maritime transport in the 2015 UN Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference of the Parties (in Paris) – which all climate policy experts anticipate – is simply ignored.

In sum, firstly, Transnet's new EIA simply adds new words and one major new citation – the overly cautious IPCC – to the prior filing, with respect to rising sea levels and extreme storms, which will endanger the Durban harbour as much as they will any other. Secondly, the EIA statement also fails to grapple with Transnet's own responsibility to cut emissions.

Please consider this letter an endorsement of the reasoning and conclusions of the SDCEA document especially insofar as we share concerns about Transnet's climate denialism. Please also compel Transnet to honestly consider the impact of its own massive GreenHouse Gas emissions, and to move to alignment with the necessary cuts in emissions that South Africa is promising, *rather than set itself up as a major saboteur of those needed cuts*.

Sincerely,



Patrick Bond
Senior Professor and Director, Centre for Civil Society