

Louisa Harstad

I understand MPCA believes Ford Area C only currently causes "minimal threat/risks" to people and the river. I'm curious if and how much MPCA has considered how they are contributing to the structure of colonization. Colonization does not exist only in the past and is not a period or event that has ended. The destruction of Dakota land (Ford Area C) is being label as something that happened in the past, giving MPCA permission to can write it off because you weren't able to prevent it in the first place. The destruction of Dakota land (Ford Area C) is still happening today by allowing this landscape to be forever changed and not doing what is possible to heal it. This land is already considered unceded territory, built on indigenous dispossession and disconnection. By allowing capitalistic companies to continue the dispossession of land, you are responsible for contributing to colonization. Minimal risks is not the same as healthy. Is the soil healthy? Are Native species choosing to grow on this land? Are animal relatives visiting this land? We need to consider all of our relatives, not just humans when we consider the Alternative options. As an Anishinaabe women and visitor to this land, I understand my responsibility to the land and recommend Alternative 6.