What does a pipeline mean to people living with it? Here are some potential problems that can be expected with pipelines:

Potential Problems:	Potential Consequences:
Oil spills: Gradual or massive spills	Poison ground and water Toxic fume emission causing sickness, death, mental problems
Pressure leaks Disruption of crops and natural plants	Reduced food sources, disturbed ecosystem, prevent farmers from making a living income
Disruption of cattle grazing lands	Fewer, leaner cows prevent farmers from making a living income
Destruction of natural plant/	Disrupt ecosystem: kill plants that grow fruit, produce oxygen, prevent animal life erosion; kill animals that depend on them
Increased risk of disaster	Massive explosions/fires lead to extreme pollution, devastate air quality, greenhouse gas emission
Poor Transnet history of monitoring/ compensation	Pipeline leaks often discovered by people living in the area after damage has been done, adequate compensation is unlikely
Pipeline vandalism/damage	Extreme weather, vandals and other external forces can cause damage, i.e. LAGOS pipeline disaster
Land use restriction	Proximity to pipeline limits what landowners can legally do with their property

A man uses a hose to douse charred bodies in the grizzly aftermath of the 2006 gasoline pipeline explosion in Lagos, Nigeria.

The DEAT must consider these possible alternatives to the proposed pipeline through South Durban.

1.) **Do not build a new pipeline.** Accelerate the upgrade of railways and public transport in Gauteng. This will reduce energy consumption and alleviate other problems such as transport-related congestion, fuel burning, emissions and associated health effects.

2.) **Refurbish the existing pipeline in an incremental manner.** As maintenance is required, replace the sections with a larger pipeline using the existing route and servitudes and install additional pump stations as required.

3.) **Build the pipeline along the route of the existing one in North Durban.** Fewer people will be affected by its presence, less land will be disturbed, and monitoring/repairing will be easier because the pipelines will be close.

Why did Transnet choose to route the pipeline along the South Durban when there are so many disadvantages to that location and it already has a pipeline in the North? Here is a closer look at alternative No. 3 above:

North Route	South Route
Lower concentration of people, more wealthy occupants, commercial farmers	Higher concentration of people, many poor residents, self-sustaining farmers
Wealthier people have more financial "cushion" to sustain them in hard times	Poorer people could be pushed to destitution by ever-worsening conditions or disasters
Wealthier people have better homes and amenities to protect from elements	Poorer people are more susceptible to air pollution (poor housing/ventilation), water contamination (poor filtering systems), and soil contamination (grow their own food).
Pipeline already exists here so a new one would minimize people affected, land damaged, etc.	Untouched lands would be torn up and new areas would be turned over to Transnet
Far less air pollution, groundwater and soil contamination. Less industry.	Excessively high pollution, air and soil contamination.
Higher lands are able to distribute polluted air better.	Low-lying valley traps polluted air preventing it from clearing out. Vulnerable to flooding.
Lands are more developed, project would have a lower carbon footprint.	Greater destruction of undeveloped non-commercial land, great impact on natural flora/fauna

Increased access to petroleum means increased use of petroleum. Locally, SAPREF and Engen would increase production. Nationally, other industries, commuters and businesses would do the same. South Africa's air emissions account for 42% of all of Africa's output and are 20 times greater per capita GDP than huge polluters like the United States. We must be slashing air emissions, not encouraging them to skyrocket. The Minister has called on developed countries to slash air emissions by 80-90% by 2050, the development of this pipeline will perpetuate poor air quality, especially in South Durban.

The use of the petroleum in this pipeline would lead to immense greenhouse gas emissions and therefore facilitate global warming. This is a national and global issue which South Africa has verbally committed to tackling. However, by supporting this pipeline and other projects, it seems that SA is not willing to act on this commitment. Furthermore, the pipeline would be susceptible to extreme weather conditions brought on by global warming. South Durban is a low lying area that is already vulnerable to flooding, rising water levels and increased flooding, and extreme weather conditions brought on by global warming. South Africa lies at the tip of the entire continent and has extensive coastlines, the land area most susceptible to global warming. Holding to our national goals for emissions reductions and our international commitments in the Kyoto protocol will not be easy, but we must do our best for the sake of Durban, South Africa and the world.

While there are many dangers to the residents of South Durban, we must also consider even larger national and global implications of this new pipeline.

SDCEA Position Paper No. 4 - September 2008