

---

**From:** Bilka, Daniel James - SDSU Student [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2015 3:53 PM  
**To:** eastriver.coop, sparsley; Fiegen, Kristie; Nelson, Chris; Hanson, Gary (PUC)  
**Cc:** Leslie Heinemann; Representative Wollmann, Mathew  
**Subject:** Re: Dakota Access Pipeline-Comments:

Senator Parsley,

You are right that there is always a danger from shipment of crude oil and; as you probably know, the Quebec incident is still working through the courts currently. I was not suggesting a rail option as the end-all, I was only highlighting the need to reinvest in our infrastructure; infrastructure that is flexible for various needs. I would be happy to see less of a strain on the existing infrastructure in place if the most sustainable long term solution is used. I would also like to see better rail company practices, not just regulations, to try to prevent such a tragedy (whether it be slow orders on such trains through towns and development, I do not know. Regardless, they should be looking at it from from a corporate standpoint).

Personally, the best option I see lately is utilizing existing means (i.e. current pipelines too, while building up their safe-guards) rather than continually expanding infrastructure for non renewable technologies. The Safer option is the better option. Thank you for your feedback so I could clarify myself. I was only speaking from the scope of research I am predominantly involved in. Lowering the dependence on Fossil Fuels can lower the strain on existing systems while creating new, sustainable, systems and jobs. Focusing on sustainable energy sources as well as energy conservation can go far in this. As your mothers probably said: "Turn off the lights if you leave the room!".

I think you could agree that there is a need for **greater** redundancies and technologies for safety from a human and environmental standpoint. If something is less cost effective, quote in quote, but it is a safer with less long term consequences, it is the more sound option.

Focus on the health, safety and welfare of humans and the environment should be the highest priority (since we are of the environment too). Remember the Golden Rule of Aldo Leopold's Land Ethic: "A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise." Everything is heavily interconnected, and interdependent on one another.

There is a great focus in society today on band-aid patches rather than constructive solutions. Too often pontificating politicians focus on the "magic pill" solution when in fact things are much more complicated. While I readily recognize that I do not at all have all the solutions, I can readily recognize and admire the problem. Regardless, we need to vett out the best option for the long term.

To you Senator Parsley, what do corporate business ethics mean to you and the company at large? How does it affect your business practices and community relations? How do they fit into the long term goals of the company? These are questions you and the others probably deal with on daily basis without always recognizing them as such.

Dan

Daniel J. (Dan or DJ) Bilka

*Rail/Transportation/Architecture/Agriculture Activist*

M. Arch Candidate

South Dakota State University

