

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/4/2021 11:57:34 PM

First name: Theodore

Last name: Benson

Organization:

Title:

Comments: The following from the 12/3/21 Minnpost expresses my primary objection to the proposed project.

It's also very important to note that every acre of the proposed ski hill expansion is firmly within the boundaries of the 1854 Treaty lands, where Band members at Grand Portage, Fond du Lac and Bois Forte retain usufructuary rights to hunt, fish and gather resources, as guaranteed by the Treaty of 1854. The Grand Portage Band has already contributed a letter of concern to the public record, particularly about the prevalence of mature maple stands (sugarbush stands) and white cedar stands that would be lost to the expansion. Both of these native tree species are identified as "vulnerable to extirpation" in the U.S. Forest Service's DEIS analysis, with significant losses to these already fragile stands laid out in the DEIS options grid. There is also the matter of traditional use, and the chipping away at Treaty lands that are often part-and-parceled out to non-Native SPU holders - individuals and companies that are profiting directly from the resources supported by Treaty lands, all the while limiting access for Ojibwe people, who are the designated co-managers of those lands, as specified in the Treaty of 1854.

Let's be clear: Once the nine new chairlifts are erected and the new chalet is built at the top of the mountain, only people who can pay the price of a lift ticket will be allowed through the gates. This is perhaps the most important socioeconomic concern about the proposed SUP, and one that's not addressed in the Forest Service DEIS.