Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/27/2021 11:14:20 PM
First name: Arnd
Last name: Scheel
Organization:
Title:
Comments: The proposed expansions appear to use significant resources while neither adding significant guest benefits nor economic benefits that could be realistically expected. Our family has somewhat regularly visited Lutsen resorts for skiing for some 10 years now, coming from the Twin Cities. The resort is at capacity during only about 2 weeks of peak season. It is hard to see how the customer base would expand beyond the current visitors from the region. Competition with (notably cheaper) resorts out west, Montana or Idaho, is just not attainable with any of the expansions proposed. We have recently found ourselves opting for the financially slighlty favorable trip to Idaho over Lutsen. The expansion would leave Lutsen highly non-competitive with raised prizes. At 4+ hours from the cities, weekly or non-peak visitors can just not come or opt for better options out west.

The diversity in terrain that is mentioned as a key factor for skiers may well be a factor in large mountain skiing areas. For choosing Lutsen, we find a diverse offering of alternative activities more important (for instance cross-country for some members in the family, which Lutsen appears to have abandoned without sign of expanding this in the expansion). Backcountry and crosscountry skiing will likely become less attractive due to the environmental impact of the expansion.

Easy new terrain is amply available and rarely overused on Ullr Mountain so it's hard to see what the expansion adds here. Challenging new terrain seems to be exclusively offered in Alternative 2 with very short runs that on the north side of Moose mountain, that would likely barely compete with ski areas more local to the cities such as Welsh Village. It's worth mentioning that Lutsen has had those north side runs closed with the exception of very few weeks since it's been difficult to keep snow on the steep slopes. In which way current plans would change this is not detailed.

We would be quite concerned with the environmental help of the area with increased need of water from the poplar river, which draws visitors throughout the year and might struggle to recover in the summer from excessive use in the winter. We have come to Lutsen in the summer for hikes along the poplar -- we would not come back for a sad leftover of excessive winter water usage.

The largest Metro skia area, Afton alps has seen stagnating prizes and dropping skier numbers since prizes have reached highs. Who are the masses of skiers in Minnesota who can handle significantly raised prizes (and won't just ski a short plane hop away for the same money)?

In summary, Lutsen is not at capacity and there's not realistic documentation who those skiers are that would additionally be attracted here. Skiers already coming may well be turned away by increased prizes that do not offer any (honestly) different terrain, just an expansion of existing terrain.

The north woods are too precious for such a poorly substantiated gamble.