

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/3/2021 5:30:08 PM

First name: Donna

Last name: Lunke

Organization:

Title:

Comments:

I am opposed to public land that affords many opportunities for all people to use the land at no or very low cost via the Superior Hiking Trail, mountain bike and snowmobile trails, enjoying the beauty of the area taking pictures or having a picnic in the wild being taken from the "public". Disruption of these activities and scarification of the landscape is not in keeping with the legacy of Cook County and the 1854 Treaty. The 1854 Treaty clearly reserves the land for usufructuary practices on the federal land and the DEIS does not clearly and adequately address this. This single issue alone should be enough to deny the SUP application

The DEIS does not address specific areas of concern completely and thoroughly such as Dark Skies, environmental equity, proximity to the SNF, water quality for nearby rivers as well as Lake Superior and most important of all, treaty rights.

If the reason for the SUP request "to improve the guest and skiing experience" is taken into consideration on page ES-1, then the impact to the local community must also be considered, not just environmental issues. Inadequately addressed on pages 112-125 were housing for employees, where employees would be found, impact to the highway system, schools, the critical shortage of medical and ambulance personnel, impact to health and human services and law enforcement and local governments' ability to humanely treat the influx of necessary workers as well as other needed infrastructure. The cost of many of these concerns will sit squarely on the backs of local citizens, many who may not be able to afford increased taxes.

3.7.5 indicates that "areas could be reclaimed and revegetated, restoring their natural condition". I am at a loss to understand how you can replace old growth cedar and sugar maple, and do not believe this issue was addressed well.

The sheer length of the proposed project spanning a 20-year period does not adequately address global warming in a satisfactory manner. The statement in 3.6.5 "mitigation that could possibly occur in the future" regarding emissions contributing to global warming is not a satisfactory conclusion.

I respectfully request that you choose Option 1 - No Expansion. Thank you so much for providing an opportunity to comment on this project.