

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/25/2021 9:40:15 PM

First name: Tim

Last name: Nelson

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am opposed to the Lutsen Mountains expansion project as it is environmentally damaging, will result in massive tree removal, including valuable maple forest that is fire resistant. This is not the right move in a time of extreme draught. We need our maple forests, undisturbed. In addition the runs they want to put in on the back side of Moose Mountain are too steep to hold snow, especially man made snow. The one run that has been in place for years is hardly ever open as it is too dangerous. Why do more of them that will not be used. Erosion in this time of extreme weather events on bare hillsides is a significant concern

The alpine ski industry has been suffering declining skier days nationally for years, as rising prices have forced millennials to give up or not start the sport. For Lutsen Mountains to undertake such a massive expansion, they are putting their financing at risk. If the ski resort goes bankrupt, who will be responsible for tearing out the ski lifts and reforestation? Like the mining companies that want to expand, the ski area should be required to fund a reclamation fund that will guarantee sufficient resources to reforest and rehabilitate the land they would be using. This fund should be adequate to insure reclamation within the next ten years as near term failure is more likely than long term failure.

This plan is not well thought out and the likelihood that it will make them competitive with western resorts is ridiculous. Western resorts have so much more terrain and variety, and much better natural snow. Yet Lutsen's lift ticket prices are already close to those of Western Resorts. The people of Minnesota would be allowing low cost leasing of forest service land, and the tax payers will be responsible for cleaning up the mess when Lutsen inevitably fails due to over expansion.on poorly thought through growth strategies. A rehabilitation fund is absolutely necessary to even think about allowing such significant deforestation.

I remain opposed to this expansion as a poor business proposition that carries significant environmental damage risk with little or no mitigation for risks beyond the expected lifetime of the operation.