

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 5/28/2020 8:54:22 PM

First name: Cassandra

Last name: Meyer

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Lutsen Mountains Ski Area Expansion Project

Dear Supervisor Constance Cummins,

Comment Continued from previously submitted, 2/2

I request the following are also included in the scoping and environmental review analyses.

How will wildlife be impacted? How will habitat be preserved? How will it be preserved in-place and not relocated?

How will wildfires and other emergencies be responded to and managed by LMC.

Additionally, if the driver for this project is the potential economic opportunities associated with skiing in the area, consider backcountry skiing.

The proposed Lutsen Mountains Ski Area Expansion Project threatens the future of backcountry skiing opportunities on the North Shore. Moose Mountain holds the most unbroken ski-able vertical feet in Northern Minnesota and is a valuable resource for backcountry skiers. Vertical feet of ski-able pitch is a finite resource in our region, and needs to be shared. Given that half of Moose is already owned by LMC, the public lands on Moose Mountain should be left for everybody else to enjoy.

Rather than granting LMC a Special Use Permit, the Superior National Forest should consider the development of a backcountry ski area on Moose Mountain. I support Superior Highland Backcountry's vision for a Backcountry Ski Area on Moose Mountain and believe this would be a better use of these public lands. An expansion of the same old type of ski area is likely not going to bring any new visitors to our region. No matter how much Lutsen expands, the fact remains that there is only 700' of vertical terrain. While this is impressive for Minnesota, it can't compete with the draw of Western resorts for the destination skier. However, diversifying the variety of winter sports available in northern Minnesota will draw new visitors. Backcountry skiing is the fastest-growing segment of the ski industry, and adding a backcountry ski area to the mix of winter opportunities already available in Lutsen will entice more people to visit the area and strengthen the economy.

The Environmental Impact Statement for this project should include an alternative that analyzes a backcountry ski area, as proposed by Superior Highland Backcountry.

I request that you choose the most environmentally beneficial option. I request that you not allow this expansion to use public lands. I request that you do not harm to the ecosystem, and the surrounding environment on these public lands.

As a member of the public and a beneficiary of these public lands, I request that you select the most environmentally sound alternative.

Disclosing the environmental impacts/harm from this project is not enough. This is public land and the harm must be zero. Otherwise, the private entity is using the public commons for private benefit and negatively harming the public. This would be solely a private gain. The public would receive no gain as use from this project by the public would literally have a price tag and an entrance fee.

Will the public be allowed to continue to freely access these public lands? If this expansion goes forward, I want

to see the proposal contain how the public will be able to continue to access these public lands without being charged. All Minnesotans should have free access to these lands.

Thank you for your continued work and public service in the times. I hope you are safe and well.

Sincerely,

Ms Cassandra Meyer

2812 30th Ave S Minneapolis, MN 55406-1676

meye0614@umn.edu